

Austin, Tex.: Historic Past, Dynamic Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Austin, Tex., my home city, the site of the State capital of Texas, has been, and is presently enjoying a physical, economic, and intellectual growth of phenomenal proportions.

The population of Austin, Tex., has doubled in the last 20 years; the enrollment at the University of Texas, located there, has tripled in the last 30 years; and the area of the city has almost doubled in the last 20 years.

To illustrate the tone of the city in combining the nostalgic, historical past and the dynamic facelifting of the present, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Dallas Morning News of Saturday, February 27, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN: HISTORIC PAST, DYNAMIC PRESENT
(By Allen Duckworth)

AUSTIN, TEX.—This pearl of central Texas—the State's beautiful capital city—has a historic and dramatic past, a dynamic present, an exciting future.

Most every community in the world has an outstanding feature. But Austin has nearly everything you can think of except ocean steamers, an active volcano, and a glacier.

The phenomenal growth of Austin outstrips most of the State capitals of the Nation.

There are many reasons.

The State government has grown and will continue to grow.

Recreation and tourism are already big businesses. There are seven big, beautiful lakes on the Colorado River, created by a series of dams, and all within a few minutes or a few hours of downtown Austin. And the Austin Chamber of Commerce is coaxing tourists to "L.B.J. Land" with maps showing how to view the President's Texas White House, only 50 miles to the west. Of course, the chamber of commerce suggests spending the night at an Austin hotel or motel.

In education, Austin calls itself the brain center of the State. The University of Texas enrollment has risen from 7,000 to 24,000 in the last 30 years. There also are St. Edward's University, Concordia College, Huston-Tillotson College, and the Presbyterian Theological College.

Research centers, both government and private, are tied closely to the university. The Balcones Research Center has 22 labs in operation, some of them doing top-secret work. Want to know how to pack a heavy truck for parachuting to earth from an airplane? They can tell you. Really. This center occupies a 393-acre tract and 34 buildings.

A department of the university does research for various agencies of the U.S. Department of Defense. And a number of private research outfits are doing contract work for the Government. There's another lab that builds up evidence against law violators, such as folks who poison their mates.

Private research organizations include

those specializing in business marketing, electronics, chemicals, petrochemicals, precision instruments, gravity meters, hydraulics—all postwar developments. Combined with the Government labs, this adds up to a major industry for Austin.

Bergstrom Field, a short expressway drive to the southeast, is a Strategic Air Command base. World leaders have landed there to be guests of President Johnson at his ranch. The President himself often arrives there en route to his Texas White House.

The capital city is wonderfully located. It is easy driving time to almost any spot in the State, with the exception of El Paso, 593 miles away. Austin is within 197 miles of Dallas, 190 of Fort Worth, 273 of Orange, 161 of Houston, 286 of Wichita Falls, 351 of Texarkana, 277 of Marshall, 139 of Corpus Christi, 76 of San Antonio, 231 of Laredo on the Mexican border, 329 of Brownsville, 351 of Odessa.

Since World War II, a new airport terminal has replaced the old wooden shack which once served the city. The thousand-acre airport with 12,500 yards of paved concrete ramp space has 24-hour service 7 days a week. Besides the more than 30 flights a day, there are 45 bus arrivals and departures, 8 trucklines in and out of the city, 3 freight railways.

Livability, says the Austin Chamber of Commerce, is a major attraction which contributes to the soaring population total. Many of those who come to Austin as public officials, from Governors to legislators, former military personnel, university graduates, decide to make Austin their home. Former Governors whose homes were in other cities before election now living in Austin are Dan Moody, Allan Shivers, Price Daniel.

Recreation facilities apparently are unlimited. The city government maintains 37 parks and playgrounds, 21 free neighborhood swimming pools, 5 municipal pools, 4 community recreation centers, 8 athletic fields, 2 municipal golf courses and a tennis center. And there's the beautiful Austin Country Club. Southwest Conference football is played in the university's Memorial Stadium.

The seven manmade lakes start at Austin's city limits and chain northward for 150 miles in the Colorado River's wonderland of hills and valleys. These lakes provide fishing, boating, water sports, hunting or just loafing in some of the luxury or rustic lodges. The dams also are for hydroelectric power and flood control.

Climate usually is ideal. The city's unique location on the Balcones Escarpment from the Edwards Plateau distinguishes it from the climate of the surrounding area. Normal temperature averages 68.2 degrees. Heating and cooling home expenses are reasonable because the city is protected to some extent from chill winds to the north and humidity from the south.

Those seeking a home or homesite have a variety of locations, ranging from grass-covered plains to tree-studded hills—new additions within the city, estates high in the hills or on a lakefront.

A cultural and entertainment atmosphere prevails. Locally, there is the Austin Symphony Orchestra, the civic theater, art exhibits, university lecture series. The cultural entertainment committee books operas, plays, concerts.

Fine churches are available for worship by those of most any faith in the land.

Austin has been a beautiful place from the beginning. There was a hamlet in the valley when they started building the first capitol there for the Republic of Texas in 1840. It was a two-room log building, surrounded by a 10-foot log stockade and a moat to discourage unfriendly Indians from disturbing the house and senate.

The early days of statehood were filled with romance. A German prince once arrived, in shining armor, to apply for public lands upon which to establish a colony. O. Henry

worked in the old General Land Office Building, now a museum, patterned by a European architect in exile after a Rhine River castle.

Elsabet Ney, famous sculptor, had her studio in Austin and there created a masterpiece which can be seen in the State cemetery, resting place of hundreds of heroic Confederate dead and some of Texas' great, near-great, and not so great—the full-size supine statue of Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston on his bier.

The French Legation of Republic days is still there. The French Minister, Count Alphonse de Saligny, was quite a problem child in olden times. He complained about the pigs in his neighborhood, running at will over his garden.

Austin's growth has been steady from the beginning. But the near-sensational boom began after the end of World War II in 1945—20 years ago.

Some statistics:

The population of Austin in 1945 was estimated at 110,000. Today, the estimate of the metropolitan area is in excess of 250,000.

Bank deposits at the beginning of 1945 were \$46,571,522. Last January 1 they were \$430,701,650, or a 20-year increase of 824.8 percent.

In 1945, Austin city limits covered 36.10 square miles. Last figures (June 18, 1964) showed 59.02 square miles.

What was Austin like 20 years ago? And what are some comparisons?

I was assigned to help to report the goings-on of the legislature in 1945. Getting to Austin was a tedious drive from Dallas. The highway was just a plain two-way traffic deal, with slowdowns through many towns or villages. When you finally made the city limits, you had to negotiate around the north of town, past the State hospital (for mental-ly ill), down the university "drag." Today, the freeway is almost completed from Dallas to the capital. Already, you can take routes that bypass such towns as Waxahachie, Hillsboro, Waco, Temple, Belton, Round Rock. And when you get to Austin, in the event you are going on to San Antonio and do not desire to stop off, the freeway takes you—elevated part of the way—right on through the downtown and suburban area.

Parking was no problem in 1945. You just left your car for the night in front of your Austin hotel. Today, at noontime, you may find it difficult to enter a downtown parking station in the hotel area. And look out for women—today's Austin Police Department employs uniformed girls to put those parking violation notices under your windshield wiper. They do it without fear or favor of those having State official license plates, such as members of the legislature.

The capital had only two hotels which could be classified as of the first class, the historic Driskill and the late W. L. Moody's Stephen F. Austin. A favorite eating place was the Millett Mansion, an ancient native stone-and-timber two-story structure where you could get a good family-style lunch for 75 cents. Today, Austin has some of the Nation's finest accommodations for travelers. A new downtown hotel is the Commodore Perry. The Driskill and the Stephen F. Austin have modernized. Before war's end, there were no motels to speak of, just some "tourist courts." Today, Austin has some of the Nation's finest, chains and privately owned. There's a downtown motor hotel abuilding, just a slingshot from the capitol grounds—the Downtowner. Two of Austin's motor inns are unique. The Terrace, an early postwar project, was erected on the old San Antonio highway across the Colorado River to the south, on a hillside, with winding roads and paths. Opened only a few years ago is the Gondolier, on the beautified and parklike south banks of the Colorado.

Austin had no luxury clubs, of the cocktail-gourmet type, after the war. Today, the town has a club at about every turn of the corner, some good and some bad. The "goods" include the first and still most ornate, the Austin Club, in the Commodore Perry Hotel.

Also in the Perry is the Deck Club, where you can drink, dine, dance and swim, all in the same arena.

Most intimate of the nice clubs is the Headliners, a must membership for newspapermen, professional men, and politicians, in the Driskill. This hotel, which still displays the original Carlotta mirrors in its historic Maximilian Room, has its own private club—Driskill Club—with relics of the inn's original bar and murals designed with cigar bands.

The Stephen F. Austin has its Capital Club. There's the Forty Acres Club for faculty and wealthy ex-students on the university drag, with hotel and health club facilities. Many of the fancy motels have private clubs.

Austin's recreational facilities really got underway just before and after the war. The chain of lakes began with the building of Lake Buchanan in 1938 to harness the Lower Colorado River. Lake Inks was completed the same year. Lake Travis (near the city limits) was built as Mansfield Dam, in 1940, and Lake Austin (also near the city limits), as Tom Miller Dam (rebuilt) in 1941. Lake Granite Shoals (Alvin Wirtz Dam) was completed in 1951, and in the same year, Lake Marble Falls (Max Starcke Dam). Town Lake (Longhorn Dam) was dedicated in 1960.

Austin has, as of the present and looking into the future, an unlimited water and power supply.

In 1945, most of State government was centered in that classic architecture of the Texas capitol, built with 15,000 carloads of Texas red granite, with interiors of Texas limestone, wainscoting of ash, mahogany, oak, pine, and cherry woods, roof of 85,000 square feet of copper, clay tile flooring, terrazzo, Texas rock aggregate.

Most of the State government was in that great building 20 years ago—Governor, railroad commission, the two branches of the legislature, supreme court, court of criminal appeals, Austin Court of Civil Appeals. About the only ones not represented were the highway commission, in a separate building, the education agency, the land office, and part of the department of agriculture. In summertime, bees buzzed the near-lobby offices of the Confederate pensions office.

After the war, when State government expanded rapidly, agencies without room in the Capitol Building sprawled all over Austin, in rented, leased, or purchased quarters.

Today, things are being brought back together. In the Capitol Building itself, few agencies exist. Main offices there now are the State legislature—house and senate, and newly acquired private offices for senior members of the house; the Governor, with refurbished second-floor offices and a new private elevator to his secretary of state's office on the ground floor, the treasurer and his supervault, built by acid through solid rock, and the comptroller of public accounts, who soon may be moved to one of the new State office buildings.

A major postwar phenomenon in Austin, contributing to the hiring of hundreds of acres of office space, has been the proliferation of the so-called trade associations.

Time was when those with special interests in Austin legislation just hired cigar-smoking, whisky-and-steak-dispensing lobbyists of the old school. Now, it is more scientific.

Austin today has permanent offices for trade associations which total 193. There are 4 international groups, 9 national, 11 regional, 4 district, 165 State.

They include such groups as the American Legion, State bar, butane dealers, classroom teachers, council of churches, electric cooperatives, lumbermen, licensed nurses, physicians of many types, oil workers, piano teachers, plumbers, University of Texas dads, veterans, brewers, State banks, State college teachers, dairymen, high school coaches, city managers, insurance men, fire chiefs and fire-fighters, florists, embalmers, drycleaners, grocers, cotton ginner, locomotive firemen, pharmacists, police chiefs, engineers, various church denominations, public employees, ready-mixed-concrete firms, sheriffs, cafe men, tobacco distributors—only a very few that make life nice and easy for leasing agents for Austin's office building space.

There is a lot of facelifting around old Austin, making it the new Austin. And there are those with nostalgic leanings who deplore it. Landmarks disappear, landmarks are restored, many old native-stone buildings remain, with new, modern faces. Yet, much of colonial Austin remains. There's the Greek Ionic style of the Governor's Mansion, frequently modernized since its erection in the last century. Out on Enfield Road, the old Governor Pease Mansion, which once had a wooden water tower, is now the home of former Gov. Allan Shivers, a man who needs no Caré packages and who spent a fortune restoring, modernizing, and expanding it for his family home.

Governments, local, State, and Federal, have contributed to the change in Austin's face.

A new Federal center of two magnificent buildings, separated by a giant courtyard, is almost completed on the eastern side of the downtown area. President Johnson will have his Texas office there.

Austin, by the way, is blessed by a sort of municipal socialism. It has so many governmental properties—local, State, Federal, plus the usual school and church lands—that a bit more than an estimated 50 percent of property values are tax exempt on municipal rolls. But the city must furnish police and fire protection. This is offset, however, by the city ownership of the power and light plant. This facility transfers millions of dollars of profits each year to the city's general fund, thus lessening the threat of a tax rate increase, says Assistant City Manager James A. Wilson, a major contributor of facts for this article.

Most dramatic example of the expansion of State government is the complex built, and all after the war, north of the capitol grounds, leading eventually to the University of Texas campus.

These are the new State office buildings.

In appearance, they are modern, but in granite, first cousins to the great Capitol Building many of the agencies have left. The capitol itself is of rugged granite from the Marble Falls region. The same granite was used to build the new buildings, although this stone is polished. First is the supreme courts building, which houses not only the State's highest court but also the court of criminal appeals, the courts of civil appeals, the attorney general's department, all formerly in the capitol itself.

Perhaps the most beautiful building of the postwar complex is the Texas Archives, which protects State papers of historic interest. The general land office also is located there.

Other new buildings behind and to the east of the capitol are the John H. Reagan State Office Building, Sam Houston State Office Building, State Insurance Building. They all match generally in granite construction. Variations are former and still occupied State buildings built before the war—the old Land Office Building on the capitol grounds and now a museum, highway department building, Texas Education Agency. The old Walton Building, once the Travis County Court-house and once occupied by the land office

and part of the agriculture department, has been demolished in favor of a parking lot.

The only major State agency now without a home on or near the capitol grounds is the railroad commission. It has offices in the old Tribune Building, headquarters of a prewar and ill-fated newspaper venture, in downtown Austin.

News media have expanded with State government. Twenty years ago, a couple of small rooms were adequate in the capitol for news correspondents. Now there are four, with all major newspapers, many of the smaller papers on a pool basis, all the wire services, some radio-TV representatives, occupying space which takes up three big rooms on the south side of the capitol and overflows to two others on the north.

The Governor's office, which includes vast space on the ground floor and main quarters on the second, has gobbled up practically all of that formerly reserved for the railroad commissioner offices and hearing room.

Austin leaders are looking ahead with confidence. The most conservative of those predict a population of 328,000 10 years hence. Capital National Bank says that by 1974, there will be wholesale trade activity to employ 31,500, manufacturing employment past the 9,000 mark. The same institution predicts jobs in governmental activities in 1974 for some 45,000 Austin residents. Combined enrollment of the various colleges, says the bank, will pass 37,000 within 10 years.

PROJECTION SHOWS TEXAS THIRD IN POPULATION BY 1975

WASHINGTON.—Texas will be the third largest State in population by 1975, Bureau of the Census projections show.

The figures were released Friday and are based on four different "alternative assumptions as to future interstate migration and future fertility," the bureau announced.

At present, by 1964 preliminary estimates, Texas ranks fifth behind New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

Projections for 1975 show Texas with 12,474,000 population following California's 24,748,000, and New York's 20,071,000.

The projections show Texas holding the No. 3 position through 1985.

One projection, based on continued interstate migration and a minor decline in fertility rates, shows Texas population as 11,481,000 in 1970, as 12,474,000 in 1975, as 13,583,000 in 1980, and as 14,749,000 in 1985.

In Vietnam—Induction Rites Fail To Impress Correspondents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., writes a weekly column for his newspaper. The latest one, dated February 25, 1965, contains some interesting information pertaining to the government situation in Vietnam which he gathered on his recent trip to that country.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include Mr. Warren's column in the RECORD:

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A965

IN VIETNAM—INDUCTION RITES FAIL TO IMPRESS CORRESPONDENTS

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The air was stifling in the so-called Gia Long Palace when the civilian government of Dr. Phan Huy Quat was formally presented to the chief of state, Suu.

Te event was hardly impressive to Western correspondents and the palace, by modern or even medieval standards, was certainly not palatial.

No air-conditioning helped to allay the sticky tropical heat of late afternoon. A few fans—swirled lazily overhead, but at the palace, in the room where the ceremony took place, the fan overhead had stopped.

LATE

True to oriental disdain of time, the ceremony had been scheduled for 3 p.m. but it was 5:30 p.m. before all the members of the new civilian Cabinet could begin.

It was not even known before the ceremony just who would be Phan Huy Quat's ministers. Apparently considerable last-minute dickerings had been going on to get a representative government.

Knots of reporters gathered at various places in the room to compare notes on the new Cabinet. There was not the slightest sign of a press release that would list the names of the new Cabinet and their ministries. Nor was there a text of the remarks of the new Premier.

QUOTE

Later, we learned he had said, among other things, that "with sincerity and effort, a stable situation will begin that will lead to final victory and bring back security and happiness to our people."

The translation of his remarks was given me by a tiny Vietnamese woman who had originally approved my application for accreditation as a newsmen, privileged to cover national, political and military events in South Vietnam.

After the translation, she added wistfully: "I am so hopeful this will provide the basis for a strong and stable government."

"We have suffered so much. After we have a strong government, the winning of the war and the unification of the country will be much easier."

REGARD

Checks with U.S. officials in Saigon revealed they had a high regard for the character of the new civilian government.

The premier, himself, had been a foreign minister in an earlier cabinet, and also had experience over the years as head of other ministers.

The new government was said to be acceptable to the Buddhist revolutionaries, who so frequently have been the catalysts that have topped the government here.

IMPRESSED

United States officials were impressed by the broad representation in the cabinet to various sections of the country and to various political followings.

But it was made clear we would have to keep our fingers crossed that such a government could survive in the volatile political atmosphere of Saigon, where the generals, the Buddhist and the politicians loved to play "musical chairs".

"You must remember," we were told, "that the South Vietnamese have no strong democratic traditions."

"And you must also remember that the peasants in the countryside don't care much who's in power, as long as their rice bowls are full and they have a certain amount of economic and physical security."

HOPEFUL

Only 3 days later, the military began playing "musical chairs" as first one set of military officials, then another took over in a series of coups.

The coups hardly contributed to the stability of the government so fervently wished for by our South Vietnamese woman informant.

Yet there are two hopeful things about the coups.

RELIEVED

Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh has been relieved as commander in chief of the South Vietnamese military forces and given a mission to the United Nations.

And the civilian government of Phan Huy Quat has been permitted to stay on.

General Khanh has been regarded as an unsettling force in the South Vietnamese political situation. He is cordially disliked by both U.S. officials and many of the South Vietnamese people of influence. His removal may give abler and less power hungry South Vietnamese a chance of building a solid government.

BASIS

The fact that Premier Quat remains head of the civilian government may provide the basis for a sturdy political leadership, so long missing in Saigon.

A government that is both strong and can command wide support among the South Vietnamese is the best contribution that could be made right now to winning the war against the Vietcong.

Montana's Indian Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I was pleased to read about the progress of a select group of Indians—52, in all, from the 7 reservations in my State—who have been participating in a special rehabilitation project in Northern Montana College, in Havre, Mont.

The 3-year-old project—supported by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration—has made significant strides toward helping disabled Indians. There is a high incidence of disability among Montana Indians—from tuberculosis and from automobile accidents, occupational accidents, and so on.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, from the January-February 1965 issue of Rehabilitation Record, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MONTANA'S INDIAN PROJECT

(By Dorothy Rigdon)

Montana, known as the land of shining mountains is also the land of bleak acres on which are located seven Federal reservations where the Plains Indians live. There are many tribes of them—Blackfeet, Northern Cheyenne, Gros Ventre, Assiniboine, Sioux, Cree, Chippewa, Flathead, Salish, Kootenai, Pend Oreille, and Crow.

From these reservations have come Charles Gopher, Burton Beatchild, Donna Old Thunder, Joseph Rainy Bird, and the 52 other disabled Indians who have thus far participated in a special rehabilitation project at Northern Montana College at Havre. I visited this project last fall, observed many of the clients on the college campus, traveled to some of the reservation territory, and dis-

cussed at length the workings of this unusual effort toward vocational rehabilitation with the five people who know most about it. They are: Glenn O. Lockwood, Montana's director of vocational rehabilitation; Wayne Flossee, DVR counselor in a huge territory surrounding Havre; Mac Johnson, director of the project; and the project's two counselors, Leslie B. Davis, an anthropologist, and Ford Johnson, an ex-science teacher with special training and competence in guidance.

This VRA-supported research and demonstration project, which began in September 1961, is seeking ways of improving both the rate and the degree of rehabilitation of Montana's handicapped Indians. The other major objective of the 5-year project is to develop the special, sustained services which people from cultures unlike ours must have if they are to adapt from their own way of life to one which is new and very strange to them.

The need for rehabilitation of Montana Indians is especially pressing because of the high incidence of disability among them. Congenital defects and tuberculosis are common, as are automobile, occupational, and other accidents. Substandard living conditions over generations have increased susceptibility to many illnesses, and low level of education has meant few occupational skills.

The special Indian project has now run for 3 years. Quite naturally, its principals have not yet accomplished all they set out to do. I am reporting here on the things they have done so far, however, along with problems still to be solved and unusual experiences they have had along the way, because I believe this account will interest all who work with disabled persons and especially those whose clients have cultural, educational, or social backgrounds which set them apart from other people in our society.

This project begins with one of the things that is clearly imperative—a rather strenuous intake procedure. A counselor interviews most clients at their homes—usually crowded, inadequate huts—on the reservations. Here the disabled Indian learns what the project is about and what it can do for him. Also at this time the counselor does enough testing of achievement, interests, and aptitudes to make a preliminary prediction of a candidate's success in the project. Sometimes tests are administered to three or four people at once in the only unoccupied building there is—a schoolroom on the reservation during summer vacation; sometimes a candidate takes tests in the back seat of the counselor's automobile.

Last summer the two counselors traveled 1,600 miles in 1 week on the reservations as they followed leads on prospective clients. This effort, plus referrals from cooperating agencies, brought 26 clients into the project this quarter and provided information on 500 Indians with handicaps. Some of these may be found to be eligible for services in the future.

The information which the counselors assemble forms the basis for a conference on each likely prospect. At this conference are the three project staff members, a college faculty member from the department in which the client will probably study, and the client's DVR counselor. Also present is a representative of one or more of the local organizations which cooperate in this project—the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Public Welfare, the Bureau of Public Health, and the Montana State Employment Service.

Before they enter the project, all clients are required to have a medical examination at the Public Health Service hospital on their reservation and to take the general aptitude test battery at the local U.S. Employment Service Office. They are then notified of the day to report to the college campus, always just in advance of a school quarter.

A966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 4

After further testing and evaluation, each client is introduced to the campus and to the life he will lead there.

More than half of the Indians served by this project have been married; three-fourths of these have families ranging from one to seven children. The single men and women take up residence in the regular dormitories. The married men are installed with their families in married students' housing—a series of ground-floor apartments on the campus.

"We have found that most Indians have unusually close family ties," Mr. Johnson told me. "Keeping the families united, so that the wife and children share the problems of a new life, is an important ingredient of our project's effectiveness."

Getting the families established is not always easy. They often have almost no furniture, for example, so the project supplies a few necessities, such as beds, tables, and chairs, from furniture the college owns.

A home economist from the local agricultural extension office helps when she is needed, counseling the newly arrived wives on shopping, budgeting, preparing balanced meals, using the laundromat, and other household management matters. Despite the great differences between this housing and that which the family has previously occupied, the wives do very well in maintaining their new homes.

Northern Montana College is the vocational and technical unit of the State university system. It offers professional training and degree programs in education, but major emphasis is on the training of young men and women in a considerable range of practical occupations. The 56 Indian clients, a fourth of whom have been women, have trained in secondary education, electronics, auto mechanics, drafting, welding, distributive education, business administration, agricultural technology, fish and wildlife management, secretarial subjects, practical nursing, and cosmetology.

Clients enroll in the regular curriculum in whichever training area is selected. If they have finished high school, they are admitted as regular students on the same basis as the other 875 students who are studying on the campus this quarter. Under Montana law, special students who did not complete high school but who are over 21 years old may also enroll. In either case, the client takes the regular college courses.

For some, indeed for most, this means a real struggle to keep up with the rest of the class. But enrollment in the full curriculum has advantages. One is that the client gets a fairly broad education, rather than job training only.

Depending on his need, a client may be in training for varying lengths of time, ranging from a single quarter to 4 years. If he makes the required grades, he has gained both vocational and educational advantages. If he cannot meet academic standards, he must leave school but hopefully not until he has some useful skills and knowledge.

Enrollment on the same basis as other students also helps to make the Indian client feel he is a part of student life. Although some of the older, married clients prefer to remain rather aloof or to associate almost exclusively with other Indians, many of the others enter enthusiastically into school activities.

The chorus is popular with them, also the more sophisticated Northern Montana Singers. Some clients have belonged to the rodeo club, the school newspaper staff, the pep club, and study clubs. A number, especially the men, have taken part in athletics, wherever disability permits this. Last year one project member was the nonplaying manager of the intramural all-Indian basketball team. An attractive young woman client was named campus popularity queen.

This interest in extracurricular activity contributes to good personal adjustment, and Mr. Johnson and his staff encourage it.

It has been clearly demonstrated that most of the Indian clients cannot hold their own alongside their fellow students without continuing, intensive counseling, supplementary tutoring, and assistance of many other kinds. The project tries to provide that special help.

The offices of the Montana Indian project are on the main floor of a campus building which also houses electronics laboratories and classrooms. It lies between the dormitories and the central part of the campus and is in the clients' daily line of march. They take full advantage of this fact. If a welfare check has not arrived in time to buy milk for the children, they seek and get temporary help. If somebody is ill or in trouble on the campus or in town, he calls on the project staff. These are special support functions.

Regular support includes much guidance and counseling. A counselor, for example, does daily individual and group tutoring in arithmetic, English, science, and other basic subjects. More than half of the 56 Indian clients are high school graduates; more than two-thirds finished 10 or more grades. But client ages have ranged from 18 to 42, and many have been away from studies for many years. One entered the project 24 years after his last appearance in a classroom.

Tutoring is, therefore, badly needed. So is the supervised study which the project provides. Despite this help, some are not able to meet the college's academic standards. Some who are dropped for scholastic weakness have had enough training while on the campus to get jobs, however, so their work has paid off, at least to some degree.

Here is the "box score" for the special Indian project up to this time: 26 of the 56 clients are now in training on the campus. One client died before completing training. Of the remaining 29, 12 left before the end of training for medical or personal reasons. Three of these twelve are now employed.

Seventeen clients have finished their training. One of these, after 20 months in the project, is continuing further training elsewhere. Ten are employed; two were relocated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (one of these is employed); one has been involved in an accident and is temporarily unemployed. The remaining three are on the reservations, but their exact whereabouts are not known. These are typical of the jobs they are filling:

A man with atrophied hand and arm overcame poor academic rating, matured socially, completed training, and is now a male nurse in the Public Health Hospital on his reservation.

A client with a severe hearing loss was trained in auto mechanics and welding, is working as a mechanic on the reservation.

Another trainee in auto mechanics was suspended for academic weakness but was relocated in Los Angeles and has a mechanic's job there.

A 2-year auto mechanics trainee is working in a Montana garage, making \$350 a month, plus commission. He is 27, the father of 3, and suffers from tuberculosis of a knee joint.

After 2 years in drafting, one client moved to Massachusetts, where he is working as a draftsman.

A woman who was diagnosed as manic depressive at the start of training, studied nursing for 10 months. She now works as a practical nurse in a local hospital.

Montana's director of vocational rehabilitation, Glenn Lockwood, gave me his estimate of the sum and substance of this unique undertaking in these words:

"In 3 years of effort at Northern Montana College, we have discovered quite a few things that have been of special help to our clients in solving their problems and achiev-

ing satisfactory rehabilitation. I would list the following: (1) A personal interview and explanation of the rehabilitation process on the reservation; (2) enrollment of Indian trainees in the regular college curriculum; (3) encouragement of maximum participation in student life; (4) keeping the families informed and involved so that they understand and share in the client's change and growth; and (5) extensive and intensive counseling, tutoring, and guidance.

"These are some of our findings to date. As we have shown, these methods have worked well with our clients, at least with many of them. We believe we have proceeded a long way toward our goals. We are quite sure that when the final 2 years of the project have ended, we will have established some valuable guidelines for others who work with disadvantaged clients."

Golden Anniversary of the National Orange Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to invite the attention of the members of the House to the golden anniversary of the National Orange Show, an exposition for the display of citrus, which has been held annually for 50 years in San Bernardino, Calif.

The first Navel orange was brought from Brazil over a century ago and was planted in Riverside County, which is the neighboring district of my colleague Mr. JOHN TUNNEY. From that seedling came the tremendous orange crops which do so much for the economy of southern California.

The dates of the show this year are March 11 through March 21, and I would be honored to have any of the Members who will be in California at that time to be my guests at the show. The Citrus Institute, which is held during the exposition, has assisted the citrus growers of my State in the exploration of machines, the conquering of citrus diseases, and new packaging programs.

Just as no word rhymes with "orange" in the English language, so, likewise, there is nothing that equals this golden fruit. I trust that all of you will improve your physical condition by drinking an orange a day.

I have received the following communications from two distinguished citrus authorities in my district and I am inserting them in the RECORD:

GOLD BANNER ASSOCIATION,
Redlands, Calif., February 6, 1965.

HON. KEN W. DYAL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

As you know, our area is primarily a Navel orange producing area and this variety ripens at a time when competition from the Mediterranean countries, including Israel, is very severe. For this reason we export very little to Europe during the winter months. The heavy export movement to Europe is during the late spring and summer months when Valencia's are in season. While we do ship

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A957

Specifically, remedial reading, literacy courses, job training, employment counseling, homemaking services, job development and training, vocational rehabilitation, are only some of the individual programs that are part of the local antipoverty program.

In all of these the key to the President's poverty program is local responsibility. To eliminate remote control from Washington, local committees have been given the basic responsibility for planning, developing, and administering their own programs and to receive Federal funds for these purposes. In each area a community action committee made up of representative citizens from in and out of the Government is being formed.

Here in Michigan we already have 15 such committees formed on a county or multi-county basis.

In Detroit it is called TAAP—total action against poverty. Mayor Cavanaugh has won national recognition for his leadership in implementing the poverty program in Detroit. The TAAP committee has developed a communitywide, coordinated attack on poverty and designated a number of specific projects within four areas of the inner city. The program involves helping youth, aged, rehabilitation of the disadvantaged, an enrichment program in the public school system, and the voluntary social agencies like united community services with their great experience and know-how in dealing with these problems.

What dangers must we be aware of?

Waste in public spending must always be watched, whether in foreign aid, the Pentagon, the outer space and missile program, or the poverty program.

Issues involving clear separation of church and state are also involved in the poverty program. The Catholic Church, for example, with millions of really poor people in its ranks, is anxious to seek Federal funds for some of its programs. Clear guidelines need to be drawn so that the wall of separation between church and state is not breached, and long-range goals that preserve the first amendment are not lost through short-range expediency.

Automation is another difficulty compounding the poverty program, because it so deeply affects the employment picture, especially the young men still in their teens who join the job force every year. Technological progress as it affects unskilled workmen poses many moral and ethical decisions directly related to the poverty program.

How does the poverty program affect you and me?

The plight of the other America remains a challenge to the American people. The silence of the poor, the invisible poor, must be ended. No more burning moral issues exists in our affluent society than the elimination of the human suffering of those who live in poverty. What is needed is the full mobilization and the commitment of churches and synagogues, labor and industry, the civil rights movement, the farmers and veterans, and students and women's organizations, in an all-out alliance against poverty. This kind of moral crusade could achieve a national awakening of conscience.

We all know that once Americans became aroused in time of war, we can unite and act quickly and effectively. Needless poverty in the midst of plenty is a war that challenges the conscience of the Nation. Without this crusade against poverty, the Great Society cannot come into full realization.

This, then, is a profile of the President's poverty program compressed into a very narrow viewing. The downtrodden and the dispossessed weigh heavily on the moral conscience of the American people and they should. Huge unmet social needs remain to be fulfilled. The war on poverty is a gigantic bootstrap operation to bring up the standard of living of one-fifth of the Nation. It obviously can't and won't be done overnight.

The challenge before you and me in the 1960's and 1970's is to match our technical know-how with the problem of poverty and thus narrow the gap between the "have's" and the "have-not's."

President Lyndon B. Johnson has taken the first steps in mobilizing the Nation toward the goal of the Great Society. As he assumes the reins of office in his own right, our prayers are for the success of his administration. May the years ahead bring this Nation of abundance an abundance of blessing. Let there be a harvest of dignity not just for some Americans or even for the other Americans, but for all Americans.

The War in Vietnam, VII—100 Hold Redoubt Against 300 Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert another part in a series of the report by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the *Courier-Express*, Buffalo, N.Y., on his recent observations in Vietnam. I recommend this informative report to all of my colleagues.

Part VII of this series, which appeared in the *Courier-Express* on February 27, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, VII—100 HOLD REDOUBT AGAINST 300 REDS

(NOTE.—Warfare in South Vietnam has many unorthodox aspects, thanks to modern weapons like the helicopter and ancient considerations like jungle and mountain terrain. Here, Lucian C. Warren, on his visit to the front, drops in on a government fortress—village well behind enemy siege lines, and finds it manned by Vietnamese of Cambodian descent.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

NUI BA DEN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—No better illustration of this odd-ball war is perhaps available than what's taking place at Nui Ba Den, which is translated: "Black Virgin Mountain."

Nui Ba Den is a peak near the Cambodian border, 35 miles southwest of Saigon. Its base is infested by Vietcong Communists. Neither side has the power, or at least has not amassed enough strength to date, to liquidate the opposing forces.

Atop this heavily fortified mountaintop, 3,200 feet above sea level, a good-looking Detroit officer, 1st Lt. John C. Sandlin, directs operations with a cool precision that belies the fact that he's sitting on a powder keg that might go off at anytime.

SURROUNDED

There are, of course, some formidable restraints that give the Vietcong pause. Sandlin can lob all kinds of shells, mortars, and rockets into any Vietcong detachment that attempts to storm the heights. And he's in close communication with substantial Vietnamese forces at Soui Da, a few miles from the base of the mountain.

Nevertheless, it is still a shocker for even the most blasé war correspondent to be able to drop in on this mountain retreat by helicopter and realize that he's completely surrounded by probably a battalion of dedicated Vietcong, numbering between 300 and 400 men, at the base of the mountain, while his only visible protection is the Vietnamese

force of about 100 men in possession of the top third of Nui Ba Den.

I voiced my awe over the fact that even Sandlin might at times go stir crazy and need to be ferried into Saigon for relaxation.

GARbled

"You know," he confided, "I really feel safer here than I do in Saigon where a saboteur's bomb could go off anywhere and often does. I let my men go once in a while, but I like it here and rarely go in except for business."

His main business is to see to it that Black Virgin Mountain is kept safe as an important radio relay point for the communications system of the American and South Vietnamese military forces.

Communication is vitally important for the success of the war against the Vietcong. For the civilian, and even the military, in this underdeveloped country, the frustrations of trying to get through by phone to any party are formidable.

COMPLICATIONS

South Vietnam doesn't have a Bell Telephone system, but a series of independent phone companies whose names—Tiger, Puma, Snow Coke, etc.—are picturesque, but whose electronics are primitive.

Therefore, Sandlin's work atop Nui Ba Den is vitally important to strengthen the military communications network.

The Vietnamese with whom Sandlin is working are largely dedicated Buddhists. They have erected one pagoda at the top of the mountain which Sandlin shares with them.

"I have to negotiate with them even to drive a nail in the wall," Sandlin explains.

Many of the religious ceremonies are held in a shrine in another pagoda a few hundred feet down the mountain.

ENOUGH

My visit to Nui Ba Den is taking place in midafternoon, when the mountain peak presents an interesting contrast of much barbed wire, sandbags, and military equipment, in the midst of which Cambodian men, women, and children seem unconcerned at the danger all around them. At one point, a huge primitive kettle rests over a slow fire and I was told that this was community stew available to all the residents, and even to guests. I decided against a sampling.

There isn't a trace of military activity this afternoon, but then the Vietcong like to do their dirty work at night. This is why the special forces there are geared mainly for night activity.

A French correspondent who accompanied us to the mountain is staying overnight, but I have elected to return to Saigon to take my chance with the bombs.

I don't dig this crazy mixed-up war.

The Soviet Effort in Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last September and October Capt. T. K. Treadwell, U.S. Navy, toured oceanographic institutions and installations in Soviet Russia.

Captain Treadwell, who holds a masters degree in oceanography, was accompanied by five other scientists. As a submarine officer in both the Atlantic and

the Pacific during World War II, and as head of the Oceanographic Division of the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office, Captain Treadwell is particularly well qualified to evaluate certain aspects of the Soviet oceanographic program. Both those in which the Russians are proficient and those in which they are deficient are stated in some detail.

I am particularly impressed by Captain Treadwell's report on the extensive Soviet activities in support of fisheries research, which includes the construction and operation by the Institute of Fisheries Research of ships up to 4,000 tons, the operation of a submarine to study fish behavior, and the employment of many vessels as ships of opportunity.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries apparently has had little success in recent years in impressing the authorities over it or the Bureau of the Budget of the need, in behalf of our own American fisheries industry, for modern, efficient U.S. exploratory and research vessels. The result is that the expansion of this field has been very, very limited.

Meanwhile, massive Russian fishing fleets haunt New England and Alaskan waters while Soviet research ships, equipped with advanced and sophisticated instruments and equipment, cruise the length of our Atlantic and Pacific Coasts and the Gulf of Mexico on exploratory missions that it is reasonable to believe are not limited to locating fishery resources.

Captain Treadwell reported highlights of his visit to the U.S.S.R. in the December 1964 issue of Navy, the magazine of sea-power. His article, entitled "The Soviet Effort in Oceanography," is proof, in my opinion, that we are engaged in a contest with the U.S.S.R. for the mastery of the oceans and their scientific secrets. This is a Soviet challenge, like that for supremacy in space, that the United States cannot afford to ignore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Captain Treadwell's article, entitled "The Soviet Effort in Oceanography," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET EFFORT IN OCEANOGRAPHY

(By Capt. T. K. Treadwell, Jr., U.S. Navy, Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Plans and Policies)

The Navy has always been interested in oceanography, particularly in its applied forms. Only within the last generation, however, have the needs been clearly identified and a systematic set of programs carried out to meet them. The fundamental problems are self-evident: A basic knowledge of the chemistry and physics of the sea; the effect of living organisms; the interplay between air and water and water on land. Given full answers to these fundamental questions, the effectiveness of naval operations could be increased severalfold.

Since oceanography is such a potent force, it obviously is of considerable interest to know how our competitors are doing.

A MONTH IN SOVIET UNION

During this past September and October, I was fortunate to be one of six U.S. oceanographers who spent a month visiting a variety of Soviet oceanographic institutions, on one of the State Department's technical exchange programs. While a full description of this

tour is beyond the scope of this article, a brief look at some typical spots may be helpful; from it, some generalizations can be made.

Topping any list of Soviet oceanographic activities is the Institute of Oceanography, under the direction of Dr. V. G. Kort. Split among three locations in Moscow, it is undoubtedly the heart of general oceanographic research. It has more than 400 personnel, of which 110 are of graduate level or higher. The institute covers all the main oceanographic topics; dynamics of ocean circulation, air-sea interaction, geology and structure of the bottom, and biology. It is more concerned with fundamental research than with the development of applications. The research vessel *Vityaz* is available full time, plus at least five smaller vessels.

The Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute at Leningrad is typical of the opposite type; it is delivering high-quality products which are needed. Research is a secondary effort. It provides ice forecasts for the northern shipping lanes, and weather information from the Arctic Ocean. Directed by an experienced, rough, young scientist, Dr. A. F. Treshnikov, it will certainly continue to grow as the Soviet Union develops its northern coastline. The 200 personnel of the institute can draw on the *Ob* and *Lena*, 12,600-ton cargo-icebreaker hulls, as well as icebreakers and other ships on occasion.

SOME RESEARCH SHIPS

The Institute of Fisheries Research in Moscow and its six major area branches exist to support commercial fisheries and to all appearances are doing a good job of it. The institute has a new class of 4,000-ton research ships; the first, *Akademik Klepovich*, is in operation now, and the next, *Constantin Vedugin*, is almost completed. Others are on the way, to supplement 60 fisheries vessels which are used as ships of opportunity.

Fisheries Institute personnel accompany every major fishing group which sails and provide specific recommendations for the conduct of the operation. Additional to this capacity, each of the area branches have their own ships, laboratories, and personnel to support local fleets. The polar branch at Murmansk has the *Severyanka*, a converted submarine which is used to study fish behavior and the operation of fishing gear. As long as the fisheries researchers continue to deliver improved fish catches, they will remain a major force in Soviet oceanography.

The State Oceanographic Institute in Moscow, under the hydrometeorological directorate, is another organization oriented toward providing services. Their interests range widely: the study of currents; the prediction of wave effects on offshore structures; flooding in estuarine areas; and the interaction of the sea and atmosphere. To support this effort, there is an extensive network of marine hydrometeorological stations along almost the entire coastline of the country. The research ships *Voykov* and *Shokalski*, 3,600 tons, are available for deep sea expeditions. Most of the work of this institute is consultative, providing the expertise necessary for other agencies to solve specific problems.

Moscow State University is the focal point of education in oceanography. Prof. A. D. Dobruvolski chairs the oceanographic group in the geography department. About 10 carefully selected students annually enter the 5-year course and the same number graduates; failures are almost unknown. Fieldwork and on-the-job training are a regular part of the curriculum, in addition to 3,500 hours of classroom work. Perhaps 10 percent of the graduates return later for another 3 years of study, leading to the equivalent of the doctorate.

In addition to Moscow State University, the Universities of Leningrad and Vladivostok also have chairs of oceanography; the Institute of Marine Engineering and the

Hydrometeorological Institute of Leningrad also train oceanographers. In all, about 60 are graduated annually at the lower level and 5 at the doctoral level. In spite of this it is still necessary to draft oceanographers from other disciplines, especially in physics, chemistry and mathematics.

Based on this limited lifting of the curtain, several things seem clear. In overall size, the Soviet effort is probably the equal of any in the world. As in the United States, it is spread across many agencies, following different courses. Although the Soviets have two major coordinating committees (similar to our own Interagency Committee on Oceanography), it does not appear that their coordination, is any more effective than ours, and most likely less. On the other hand, much firmer direction can be exercised in the U.S.S.R. if and when it is considered necessary.

Evidently the number of personnel engaged in the marine sciences is larger than here. Further, their production of trained oceanographers is substantially higher than that of the United States. There is the added advantage of being able to detail personnel where needed, rather than rely on inefficient persuasion. Those scientists contacted seemed to be content and technically well-qualified. It does not appear, however, that man for man (or man for woman, since they use a far higher percentage of women scientists than do we) they are the equivalent of the U.S. scientists. The spark of enthusiasm was often lacking and individual productivity seemed low.

Soviet oceanographic ships have received considerable commendation and certainly much of it is merited. The only one visited seemed to be well designed for multipurpose cruises, although much more crowded than those of the Western World. The actual number of ships are almost impossible to compare. The Soviets have a far larger ship-of-opportunity program in operation and these are hard to identify and evaluate. It would seem that the two capabilities are, in balance, not significantly different.

SHORE FACILITIES SAD

The short facilities of the Soviet oceanographic institutions are surely the worst part of their program. Research centers are rusticated into rundown country palaces of the last century, or stuck into the basements of apartment houses. Crowding was the rule; lighting, heating and general office support equipment were ancient.

Instrumentation seemed to be adequate and rugged, although very few innovations were noted. Foreign sources formerly provided much technical equipment and a lot of it is still seen from East Germany, Poland, Britain, and the Scandinavian countries. Examples of quantity production by Soviet factories are increasingly seen, although these are frequently "Chinese copies" of foreign items. Automation was almost unheard of.

EMPHASIS ON PRACTICAL

The routine collection and processing of data is certainly a strong point of the Soviet program, although it is being carried out by brute force by large numbers of people. Only one computer and one electric desk calculator was seen; the standard mathematical tool is the abacus. It was further noted that limited runs of publications and periodicals made them hard to obtain, even in the Soviet Union, and almost impossible to find abroad. World Data Center B, the focal point of international data exchange, was a disappointment; it only had a few shelves of publications available and no data in the usual sense of the word.

The research programs were generally disappointing; most of those seen were unimaginative and showed few lines of work worth pursuing. In their applied programs, however, every effort is being made to get something useful for their money, and in

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4097

systems are never satisfied. And we learned that it is better to halt aggression early in the game, rather than wait for it to spread its tentacles over one people after another, one nation after another, until it can be stopped only by the most massive expenditures of men and treasure.

Then, there are those who say "we must negotiate."

That sounds not unreasonable. For peace is our goal—as it is that of the Vietnamese people themselves. But negotiate with whom? On what terms? To what end?

The restoration of peace is one thing. But neither we nor the Government of South Vietnam are interested in negotiations that represent merely the acceptance of foreign conquest or the confirmation of aggression.

There is a good deal more talk about negotiation here and in other Western capitals than there is in Hanoi or in Peiping.

The Communist regimes have made it obvious that they are not very much interested. They have said—most recently in an editorial in the People's Daily in Peiping—that they believe that by negotiation we mean to try to get in the conference hall what cannot be achieved on the battlefield.

Chou En-lai, the Red Chinese Premier, has made it clear what his regime thinks about negotiation, and the price we should pay.

In a message to the so-called Indo-chinese People's conference in Cambodia, he said last week:

The United States and its followers must withdraw their military forces from Indochina completely, immediately, and unconditionally.

Where have we heard that word before?

That is Peiping's formula for our surrender. It underlines what has always been—and remains—Red China's main policy objective: to get the United States out of Asia so that communism can take over.

Mr. President, the United States is not going to oblige Mr. Chou En-lai. It is not going to oblige the Communist regime in Hanoi. It is not going to cut and run. It is not going to surrender.

So long as there are men in southeast Asia who are eager to stand on their own feet and who need our help to meet attacks from the outside, they will find in us a willing partner. Our help has been going to them—and it will continue to go to them.

If the regime in Hanoi wishes peace, it can have it. All it has to do is to start leaving its neighbors alone. Then there can be peace in southeast Asia. What is needed is not talk; what is needed is an end to aggression.

But there is now no sign that the regime in Hanoi is willing to adopt this course.

The problem in Vietnam is one of outright attack—pure and simple. The fact that it is conducted in semiconcealed fashion makes it none the less real and none the less dangerous. As the white paper of the State Department has pointed out very clearly, that aggression has been growing, not diminishing. The flow

of men from the north has increased. The flow of arms and ammunition has grown.

The heart of the matter is a brutal attack by the Communists against the territory, the people, and the independence of a sovereign state. That is why our forces are in Vietnam. That is why they went there in the first place. That is why they remain.

If the regime in Hanoi abandons its ambitions to conquer its neighbors, then the situation can change. But not before.

For free men can fail to recognize aggression—and to meet it squarely—only at their own peril—and at incredibly greater cost later. We have recognized the danger. We are helping to meet it. We shall continue to do so, as long as that danger persists.

CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, much has been said today in the Senate regarding Vietnam and our situation there. I listened with admiration to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the assistant majority leader, in connection with the fine statement that he has made on our being in South Vietnam and on what has been going on there. I approve of what he has said.

However, I am somewhat disturbed by a headline which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, and probably also appeared in other newspapers throughout the country. It reads: "About 75,000 Vietcong Slain, Army Chief Says at Hearing," quoting Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Harold K. Johnson.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have been very diligent in attending the meetings of that committee—the public hearings and the executive hearings—and I have read the record. I have heard the testimony given by General Johnson, the Army Chief of Staff. I take exception to his statement being made public as apparently it was. In my view, his statement that 75,000 Vietcong troops have been killed in Vietnamese fighting is not factually correct on the basis of my information.

Statements of this nature should come from the Secretary of the Army or from the Secretary of Defense or some civilian official in the Government. The Founding Fathers very wisely provided that in the United States civilian authority must always be supreme over the military. We hold our Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces and we hold all the officers of our Armed Forces in the greatest respect and admiration. We know that today the United States is the most powerful nation that ever existed under the bending sky of God at any time in the history of the world, and that our Armed Forces have tremendous supremacy over all the forces of the world combined.

As we all know, the Vietcong attack in the night, as a rule. Assuming that on a certain night 10 attacks by Vietcong guerrillas are made on 10 hamlets manned by South Vietnamese forces, plus some American officers, and assuming that of these 10 attacks, 1 succeeds and 9 fail, and further assuming that dead are left on the field, the facts are

that the same kind of clothing is worn by the Vietcong infiltrators and the Vietnamese villagers. Therefore, some of those killed might be villagers and some might be innocent civilian victims of gunfire. Furthermore, granting that since 1960 there has been some sort of counting of the dead, is it not natural that the leaders in those villages 250 miles from Saigon would report back to Saigon and exaggerate their successes with respect to the number of enemy dead? We do know, from what we have read and from the record that is available to any student of this subject, that it is not provable that 75,000 Vietcong have been slain, as General Johnson is quoted as having said.

I am certain that anyone in our Armed Forces, anyone in the Defense Department, and any Senator would say that there can be no definite estimate of the number of Vietcong slain, whether it is 70,000, 60,000, or any other number. There is no way to know the exact number.

The general is quoted as saying that "the Red guerrilla cause is being hurt." Of course, any cause is hurt when there is a loss of life. However, should anyone who reads the newspapers of today or of any time this month see a map of South Vietnam of a year ago, and compare it with the territory where the Vietcong predominate in South Vietnam today, he will see that a much larger area or many more areas are predominantly Vietcong than there were a year ago.

I do not wish to labor the point too long, but I feel it is unfortunate that any high Army officer should make a statement that is misleading, cannot be supported as being factually correct, and and makes erroneous inferences.

AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few moments ago, the majority whip, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], delivered a very powerful and enlightening statement on the situation in Vietnam. All such statements coming from the leadership are very welcome in this body. As all of us know, to some extent at least, they express the opinion of those on the administrative side of the Government.

The Senator from Louisiana has brought to the attention of the Senate some of the facts which all of us know, but sometimes these facts need to be reiterated.

I believe all of us agree, as we did when the Democratic Party had a majority in the Senate and the House of Representatives, and there was a Republican in the White House, that there is only one President of the United States. We have only one President at a time. And whatever actions are taken by the administration, we want to be in a position to support them most effectively. We realize that the President is the only President we have. He is charged under the Constitution with the responsibility of conducting our foreign affairs.

The Senator from Louisiana has done a magnificent job in pointing out the fact that this is not a question of how the

President should conduct himself or how foreign affairs should be conducted, but exactly how we shall meet the Communist threat of aggression, subversion, sabotage, and terrorism, all of them mixed together. They want to take us over. They want our way of life exposed. They do not want us to continue in our system in opposition to theirs.

As I said, we have only one President. I am certain that he has the wisdom, strength, and courage to carry forward the best interests of this Nation. He has the facts, and he has the availability of the full resources of the Nation, which is far beyond any power accorded to any other one individual in the United States. The President has his advisers. He must rely upon them. He has the responsibility, the wisdom, the facts, and the advisers.

I would want to be the first to try to do everything possible to enable the President to make it as easy and safe for America as possible.

In addition the President has something else, as demonstrated by the statement of the junior Senator from Louisiana. He has an overwhelming mandate from the people to continue to exercise this authority. This mandate was evidenced last November. The President has the confidence of the American people, not alone in domestic affairs, but also with regard to how he should handle things overseas. The reservoir of good will and confidence the American people have in him should be utilized to the fullest.

I believe that all of us would be willing to support him more strongly than we have at times, if we were really certain at all times which way we were going. The reluctance on the part of some of us to express ourselves more fully in this connection is occasioned because we do not want to be in a position of saying something which would make the President's position more difficult in a time of crisis or international tension.

In addition to the confidence people have in him, I think sometimes we are reluctant to take full advantage of the confidence that the United States has generated throughout the world that we will defend the idea of freedom and not only commit our manpower, but also everything we have to defend freedom throughout the world.

Nothing illustrates this more than the Cuban crisis. There was a question as to where some of the Latin American nations would line up. At that time we saw every single Latin American nation line up in support of President Kennedy in making it forcibly understood that we in no way intended to have the Communist ideology and revolutionary thought extended any further than it was.

I had occasion to go to Guinea, which at that time was thought to be leaning to the other side. There is an airport there, built completely with Russian money. When the Russians asked per-

mission to land bombers on this runway, the President of Guinea said, "No; we do not think it ought to be used for that purpose." The first jet that landed on that runway, built with foreign funds, was a French-built, French-operated jet-plane.

There is a good deal of support and confidence throughout the world in the ability of America to conduct the fight for freedom.

I think the President can rest assured that he has the confidence of the American people, and the confidence of the majority, as well as a substantial part of the minority of both the Senate and House of Representatives. I would urge my colleague and dear friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, to continue to make these statements as often as he feels, in good judgment, they can be made, not only because they are informative, but also because in many ways they satisfy the desire of the group of people who are working so closely with the leadership on what we are trying to make effective.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the very gracious remarks he has made with regard to the statement by the junior Senator from Louisiana. In line with what the Senator is saying, the only way that this Nation can be effective in foreign affairs is to act with a singleness of purpose.

Some of us may have ideas as to how a policy can be made more effective. Some of us may have suggestions as to how perhaps the Government of South Vietnam might act more effectively to gain more support, loyalty, and dedication from its people, if that be necessary. But, for this Nation to act more effectively, we cannot move forward with 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 different foreign policies. We must unite behind one policy and one program. The only way we can do that is for some of us who have ideas and suggestions to give them to the President and let him sift out the best ideas with which he can meet the problem that confronts us and give this Nation a purpose that is unified and which all of us can support.

Let me say to my able and distinguished friend that sometimes it is necessary for some of us to yield some of our own thoughts and accept the ideas of others, and unite behind a single thought. Sometimes we do a greater service if we inform the President or his advisers about the matter rather than give the impression on the Senate floor that we are not in agreement with the President when he makes these very difficult decisions, which he well knows may cost the lives of American boys and involve this Nation in very great danger. The point is that if he does not make the correct decisions, there will be even greater danger.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Louisiana points out in the last paragraph of his statement:

For freemen can fail to recognize aggression—and to meet it squarely—only at their own peril and at incredibly greater cost later. We have recognized the danger. We are hoping to meet it. And we shall continue to do so as long as that danger persists.

I urge the Senator to have the administration make a clear expression of how it is going to be met, to have the people convinced of his good judgment, to have the people have the feeling that they are joining in the effort—not that they are reluctant at the moment, but I do find—this is a problem so many Senators are facing—that people ask the questions, "What are we doing there? Are we winning? Are we going to win in the long run?"

They want to have reassurance by facts and material, as has been done today. They want to have a reassurance of a determination and a conviction that in the long run we will continue and in the long run ultimately we will win.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, March 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1965:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Roger L. Stevens, of New York, to be Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. George G. Burkley, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while serving at the White House, pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 4, 1965:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1971. (Reappointment.)

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 4, 1965:

The nomination sent to the Senate on January 29, 1965, of Walter G. Carney to be postmaster at Armagh, in the State of Pennsylvania.

development, if it is in fact an issue, should be the subject of separate legislation," the bill was passed without objection.

Although it is recognized that a bill to accomplish the same purpose was enacted as S. 111 of the 88th Congress, good legislative procedure would dictate the desirability of having hearings and reports available for study by the Members for a reasonable length of time. In this case, it is extremely doubtful if even the reports were available 2 hours before the Senate met and took up the bill. This is particularly significant since there appears to be very little urgency for the immediate consideration of the bill. If, however, there were very cogent reasons for the immediate consideration of such a proposal, it would seem that the very least the Members could expect would be a quorum call.

The question of the establishment of river basin commissions was thoroughly considered by the Select Committee on Water Resources, headed by the late distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr. Senator Kerr took the position that it would be unwise to provide blanket authorization for the creation of river basin commissions. If and when the desirability of such a Commission was demonstrated, the committees could authorize the creation of such a Commission tailored to meet the particular needs of the area. Pursuant to this philosophy, there was created the Delaware River Basin Commission. As a result, each year we have been appropriating funds for the salaries of the alternate Federal representative and his staff, together with a contribution toward the cost of a Commission staff located within the basin. For these purposes, the Congress appropriated \$39,000 for salaries last year and has been requested to appropriate \$44,000 for fiscal year 1966. For the contribution toward the Commission staff, the Congress appropriated \$92,000 last year and has been requested to appropriate \$96,000 this year. Notwithstanding the existence of this Commission, the demand for studies by the regular Federal agencies have, if anything, increased with a corresponding increase in the cost of each individual study because of the additional coordination and review required. It may be that at some time in the future the value of such a river basin commission will be clearly established. At the present time, its value is questionable.

I wonder if the Congress intended to convey as broad powers upon the Water Resources Council as the act apparently would confer. For instance:

Sec. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan for revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

If this paragraph means what I think it does, the Congress is abrogating its

authority and control over water resource development to a Council appointed by the President and the Governors of the States bordering the river basin. It has not been too long since Congress expressed its disapproval of budget circular No. 847 in such forceful terms that that directive was rescinded. New criteria has recently been issued for the evaluation of navigation projects which, in my judgment, will negate the principles embraced by the administration in adopting the recommendations of the Kerr committee in Senate Document No. 97.

With respect to the establishment of river basin commissions, it is apparent that such a commission can be established if a majority of the States in a basin desire such a commission, and such an organization would then be forced upon the other States in the basin which may oppose the creation of such a super-planning agency. This is exactly the sort of thing that Senator Kerr strove to prevent.

Under "Powers and Administrative Provisions of the Commissions," we find:

(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary.

It may be significant that the word used here is "acquire" and not "rent." Certainly, this authority would be broad enough to acquire by purchase. Do we really want to convey such authority upon innumerable river basin commissions?

When we come to the matter of compensation of Commission members, we find:

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended—

In other words, we are providing authority to employ a Chairman of a river basin commission for \$24,500 a year, which is in excess of the salaries paid the Governors of Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming; and substantially the same as the salaries of 12 other States that pay their chief executives \$25,000 a year.

Another very questionable provision of that bill would be section 207 (a):

Each commission shall recommend what share of its expenses shall be borne by the Federal Government, but such share shall be subject to approval by the Council. The remainder of the commission's expenses shall be otherwise apportioned as the commission may determine . . . Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions.

With blanket authority of this type made available to undisclosed numbers of river basin commissions that could be established, there would be little control which the Appropriations Committee could exercise after the agreements were consummated by the Federal representatives on the river basin commissions and the Council.

The bill provides for an annual appropriation of \$10 million to carry out the purposes of the act. I doubt whether such appropriations will be adequate after the potentials of empire building under this authorization are fully realized.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that the conference report on the Inter-American Bank will be brought up on Monday, as will be the bill calling for the continuation of the disarmament agency, and sundry nominations.

AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, Communist aggression—and subversion—and sabotage and terrorism—these are not something new under the sun. We have seen them before. Doubtless we shall see them again.

We saw them at work nearly two decades ago in Greece. There, Communist guerrillas tried to conquer a free people. They got help in the form of weapons and equipment from their comrades abroad. They were able to use neighboring territory as a sanctuary. American assistance and military advisers helped our Greek allies to beat back the Communist rebellion. When a conflict within the Communist camp shut down the flow of supplies and eliminated the sanctuary, it sounded the death knell to this Communist attack on freedom.

In Malaya, a large-scale Communist guerrilla movement tried to win over that country. With persistence—and at great expense in lives and money—Malayan and British forces were able to isolate the Communist rebels from the majority of the population and to crush the subversive movement. But it required a dozen years and great efforts.

In the Philippines, the Huk movement threatened to conquer the country. Inspired local leadership, imagination, and determination—plus effective assistance from American friends—enabled the Filipino people to preserve their freedom.

In Korea, the massed might of the Soviet-directed North Korean Communist armies swept south across the 38th parallel in 1950 to conquer South Korea. U.S. forces and contingents from other U.N. members moved in to help the South Koreans. The aggressors were thrown back. Even though the full weight of Red China's armies entered the battle, the Communists were never able to achieve their goal—the conquest of South Korea.

The lessons of these two decades of Communist aggression are clear. The Communists will try whatever tactics

they believe will succeed in conquering territory and peoples by force. In each case, they will try different tactics and methods that they believe will work for them in the local circumstances. But another lesson is just as clear—if free men are determined to stay free, and if they can rely on needed help from their friends, they can succeed in beating down the Communist efforts to conquer them and to absorb them as new colonies in the Communist world.

Today, in Vietnam, we are seeing the latest effort by the Communists to seize new lands and to capture a people who want to be independent. It has been going on for more than a decade. But in the past year or two, it has reached entirely new levels of intensity. While the war in Vietnam shares some of the characteristics of each of the previous Communists efforts at conquest, it has some elements that are entirely new.

For the first time, foreign territory is used not merely as a sanctuary for the Communist forces but as the principal base of operations. The entire effort to conquer the South was conceived in North Vietnam—it is directed from North Vietnam—it is supplied and maintained by North Vietnam. The bulk of the hard-core Communist forces were trained and supplied by the Army of North Vietnam. Increasingly, the officers and men moving into the South are North Vietnamese who have never even seen South Vietnam before.

In addition, the Communists are waging not merely a military war. They are not relying solely on armed attacks and terrorism, though these are vital to the effort. They have also developed a comprehensive political and propaganda machine to back up their efforts. They are working day in and day out to influence and cajole, to mislead and misguide the people. They seek to weaken morale and to undercut the authority of the South Vietnamese Government by every possible means. They are, in short, fighting a full-scale military and political war using every weapon in the book.

We cannot pretend that we have discovered fully effective countermeasures to meet this new kind of warfare. But the South Vietnamese have developed a much better understanding of the enemy over recent years, and their capacity to meet the threat is improving.

So long as the Communist rebels can rely on a steady supply of new men, new weapons, fresh ammunition, and supplies from the North—and this flow has increased decisively in the recent past—it will be difficult indeed for the defenders in the South to cope with both the military threat, the terrorism, and the all-out campaign of political and psychological warfare that is going on.

There are no easy and obvious answers to this new style of Communist aggression. Under the best of circumstances, it is going to take time to fully defeat this attempt at conquest. For the present, it will probably be necessary to do what is now being done—to meet the most pressing armed threat on the ground, in the jungles, and in the mountains. We hope that the new government in Saigon will be able to turn more of its

attention to the need to wage more intensive and extensive war on the political, social, and economic fronts.

(At this point, Mr. KENNEDY of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in the meantime, it is urgently necessary to convince the authorities in Hanoi who are running this war that their efforts will be in vain—that they cannot succeed—that they stand in the long run to lose far more than they can hope to gain by attacking the south and ignoring the desires and the hopes and the needs of their own people.

It is generally agreed that the foreign policy of a republic such as ours should be responsive to the will of its people. It is.

A few days ago, it was suggested that our actions and our policies in Vietnam would perhaps be different if we, the people, were deciding those actions and determining that policy. I disagree most emphatically. For it is evident to me that the people have spoken—loudly and clearly—on this issue.

Whether one looks at the votes of this body or of the House, whether one looks at the opinion polls or at the votes of our people, we find a ringing endorsement for the actions of this administration—and of previous administrations—in regard to Vietnam. The people of the United States have made it unmistakably clear that they are ready and willing to help the people of South Vietnam resist the aggression which has been forced upon them from the outside.

More than 10 years ago, in 1954, President Eisenhower defined that policy. He determined that it was in our national interest to lend assistance to the new, young Republic of Vietnam—to help it make its own way and to resist the armed threat it faced even then. Writing to the president of South Vietnam, President Eisenhower said:

The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping, weakened by a long and exhausting war and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

President Eisenhower went on to say:

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means.

We have gone forward with that program of assistance in the intervening years, increasing it as the pressures on South Vietnam increased, as the size of the aggression against her expanded.

Once again, the people spoke through their elected representatives in 1955. Then the Manila Pact, which included South Vietnam as a protocol state, was approved by this body by a vote of 82 to 1.

More recently—in August of last year—the Congress resoundingly approved a joint resolution concerning our actions in Vietnam. Among other things, that resolution stated:

That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures

to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

And that—

The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

And that—

The United States is, therefore, prepared as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of Armed Forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

I remind you, Mr. President, that this resolution was approved by the votes of 414 Representatives in the House. In the Senate, the vote was 88 to 2.

The people of the United States have expressed themselves clearly—and unequivocally—in this combined vote of 512 to 2 in support of our President.

I remind the Senate that the President himself, all the Members of the House, and many of the Members in this body have since submitted themselves, their records, and their expressed opinions to the judgment of our sovereign people. The Senate will recall the results last November. It was the most impressive vote of confidence ever rendered by the people in a President and his administration of our foreign and domestic affairs.

Now, the two Senators who voted against the joint resolution of last August have done a good deal of talking about the situation in Vietnam. Indeed, it seems to me they have, between them, talked on this matter almost as much as the rest of the Senate put together. But there is no evidence that they have altered to any significant degree the opinions of this body—or of the great American people.

President Johnson described our policy when he signed the joint resolution of the Congress. He said then:

To any armed attack upon our forces, we shall reply.

To any in southeast Asia who ask our help in defending their freedom, we shall give it.

In that region, there is nothing we covet, nothing we seek—no territory, no military position, no political ambition. Our one desire—our one determination—is that the people of southeast Asia be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way.

There are some who now say that, in the face of mounting aggression from North Vietnam, we should cut our losses and get out. They would have us abandon our friends, drop our commitments, and surrender our honor.

That, I submit, is not our way. That, we shall not do. So long as there are South Vietnamese who wish to fight for their freedom, who are willing to oppose the foreign tyranny that seeks to impose itself upon them, they will find us at their side, helping in every practical way.

The voices that say "Get out" remind me of those voices of 25 years ago who said "Stay out." But we learned then—to our sorrow and at incalculable loss—that aggression will not be appeased. We learned that tyranny feeds on its own successes. We learned that dictatorial

I am a Christian nation founded upon Christian principles. My people recognize God's power and authority and their responsibility to Him.

I am a nation that believes in the worth and dignity of the individual and his inability to solve his own problems without the help of God.

A sense of responsibility to God carries my people beyond the short-range view of what they can get for the moment. They consider the future benefits or damages as a result of their actions and conduct.

I am a government that is responsible to God and the people. Most of my organic documents of government—the Mayflower Compact of 1620; the Declaration of Independence of 1776; the Constitution of 1789—give recognition to God.

I am a nation of freedom-loving people. God created my citizens as free moral agents with the power to choose between right and wrong. Freedom is possible for those citizens who choose the right. Tyranny, suppression, and slavery is the lot for those who choose the wrong. William Penn, one of my great statesmen and patriots, summed it up accurately when he said: "If men will be governed by God, then they must be ruled by tyrants."

I am the front porch of a farmhouse in the Midwest. The front porch is associated with no other country. It is a place to sit and relax for a few moments before you finish the day's chores. It is a place to sit and read the paper or visit with your neighbors.

Political posters tacked on the country store near the crossroads down by the creek are a part of my heritage. The tiny country churches, roaring snows, howling winds, endless fields and crystal clear lakes are all a part of me.

I am big, I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific, more than 3½ million square miles of throbbing private enterprise. Within my boundaries lies a wonderful country. I am a land of fertile fields, country mailboxes and winding country lane. I am remote quiet villages and large metropolitan cities that never sleep.

I am a republican form of government with the Constitution as my cornerstone. It is the best plan ever devised by man to assure freedom and to release the creative powers of everyone. Its guarantees of life, liberty and property have made possible the great American way of life.

You can look at me and see Patrick Henry ending his fiery speech before the Virginia Convention with these defiant words: "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." You can see the colonists discussing their problems at a town meeting, the building of the Wilderness Road and Lewis and Clark crossing the Continental Divide. You can see the multicolored lights of Christmas and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the old year passes.

Yes, I am the United States of America and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I always possess the integrity, moral courage and strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a stronghold of freedom and a beacon of hope to all the oppressed throughout the world.

This is my prayer—my goal—my wish.
May God be with me, always.

Greater Pittsburgh Career Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, KQV Radio in Pittsburgh has performed a great public service to my home city with its sponsorship of the Greater Pittsburgh Career Exposition. More than 36,000 persons attended the 3-day program at our beautiful Civic Arena—a program designed to showcase the many career and training opportunities available in the Pittsburgh area and to emphasize to citizens of that area the importance of continuing education and training.

The program was aimed not only at youths of the Pittsburgh area but to unemployed persons interested in retraining programs and to adults interested in self-improvement or further education. The Career Exposition, incidentally, broke a 3-year attendance record for a public exposition at our \$22 million Civic Arena. Already several other cities are planning similar programs based on the success of this one. KQV Radio is to be highly commended for its sponsorship of this exposition as a major contribution to a healthy economy in the Pittsburgh area and as a pattern for other communities with similar problems.

I recommend to my colleagues in the House who represent such communities that they study this successful pattern.

A Bill To Amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement.

This bill is intended to straighten out a system that encourages unnecessary absence and deprives other employees of the fruits of their dedication.

This bill is intended to reward all employees—the sick and the healthy. Fur-

ther, this bill would be an added incentive for many employees to use their sick leave more prudently because they would know that payments would be made for unused sick leave.

I urge this bill as one which would do a great deal to strengthen and develop our civil service system and treat all employees equally, fairly, and justly.

White Paper on Vietnam Says It Well, Says South Bend Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues and appropriate officials of the State Department a thoughtful editorial concerning the State Department white paper on Vietnam. The editorial appeared in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune on March 2. The editorial follows:

WHITE PAPER SAYS IT WELL

The State Department white paper on Vietnam is all the more useful because of its timing. For it comes when there is mounting pressure from various quarters to generate negotiations for ending the conflict. And it is highly important, as the State Department noted, "for freemen to know what has been happening in Vietnam, and how, and why."

In the circumstances, it is incumbent upon the United States to make clear to the world the reasons for its involvement in the struggle and to deal with the criticism of the American role.

The document, it seems to us, does an admirable job on both scores.

It refutes the Communist line that the conflict is a civil war and shows it for what it really is—a carefully planned and executed aggression from the north aided and abetted by Red China and others in the Communist camp.

The evidence is damning.

Another important reason for issuing the paper is the continuing need to keep the world informed of the reasons for the American presence in South Vietnam.

As the paper notes, we are there because our help has been requested by the duly constituted government. And it notes, the United States "will not abandon friends who want to remain free."

The paper says that the United States would be ready at once to reduce its military involvement if peace could be restored, but adds significantly "the choice now between peace and continued and increasingly destructive conflict is one for the authorities in Hanoi to make."

The document says it all and says it well.

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on Goddard Day and Kaniksu National Forest.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 3971-4082

Bills Introduced: 60 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1336-1395; S.J. Res. 57-59; and S. Res. 84. **Pages 3980-3982**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Report of Committee on Government Operations entitled "Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations" (S. Rept. 69), filed March 2 under prior authorization;

S. 435, extending the boundaries of Kaniksu National Forest, Idaho, with amendment (S. Rept. 70), filed March 3 under prior authorization;

S. Con. Res. 2, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, with minority views (S. Rept. 71); and

Report of Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of Committee on Government Operations entitled "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics," with additional and individual views (S. Rept. 72). **Pages 3967, 3979-3980**

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to Committee on Public Works. **Page 3971**

President's Message—Cities: Message from President recommending legislation on the problems of cities and the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development was received by Secretary of Senate while Senate was in adjournment on March 2—referred to Committee on Banking and Currency. **Pages 3967-3971**

President's Communication—Data Processing: President's communication transmitting report by Director of the Budget on management of automatic data processing in the Federal Government was received, ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 15, and was referred to Committee on Government Operations. **Pages 3976, 4010**

President's Communication—Rapid Transit: Communication from President transmitting draft of proposed legislation to authorize Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, was received—referred to Committee on Commerce. **Page 3976**

President's Communication—Oceanography: Communication from President transmitting his national

oceanographic program for fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying document) was received—referred to Committee on Commerce. **Page 3976**

Appointment to Board: It was announced that Vice President has appointed Senator Williams of New Jersey to the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. **Page 4010**

Authority To Report: Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to file during adjournment until noon Monday, March 8, its report on H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations, with individual views. All other committees likewise were authorized to file reports during adjournment. **Pages 4009-4010**

Goddard Day: Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 301, to designate March 16 of each year as a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, thus clearing the bill for President's signature. **Pages 4015-4016**

Kaniksu National Forest: Senate passed with committee amendment S. 435, extending the boundaries of Kaniksu National Forest, Idaho. **Pages 4035-4038**

Lincoln Inaugural Reenactment: Senate recessed while it attended on the east steps of the Capitol the reenactment of the Second Inaugural Address of Abraham Lincoln in observance of the centennial anniversary of its delivery. **Page 4035**

Messages From President and House: Secretary of Senate was authorized to receive messages from President and the House during adjournment of Senate until Monday, March 8. **Page 4010**

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Monday, March 8, Senate expects to consider conference report on H.R. 45, to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act, to be followed by H.R. 2998, continuation of the Disarmament Agency, and the confirmation of sundry nominations. **Page 4095**

Confirmation: The nomination of John W. Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, was confirmed. **Page 4098**

Nominations: One civilian and one Navy nomination were received, and one postmaster nomination was withdrawn. **Page 4098**

many areas, such as ice prediction, fisheries, engineering applications and coastal control, they are doing very well.

In summary, the Soviet oceanographic program is massive and slanted toward practical applications. It is being carried out by large numbers of average people, led by top-flight scientists, under the disadvantage of commonplace equipment and poor working conditions. Significant advances have been made in the last 20 years and the trend will doubtless continue.

Comparison of the Soviet and United States efforts is difficult, since basic differences exist. The Soviets stress applications and give research a back seat; we pour the bulk of our resources into research, and all too often pay only lip service to useful products. At the present moment, it would seem that Russia is getting as much for their money as we are, in the form of practical applications. They seem to lack a strong program of fundamental research which is clearly necessary to provide the basis for achievements a decade or generation in the future. Their shortsightedness in this regard will sap their strength, surely and soon.

It would be equally shortsighted of the United States to neglect those phases of its own effort which are lagging, such as education, shipbuilding, and the development of practical applications. This visit provided the opportunity to see a part of the Soviet program. Perhaps even more important than that is the opportunity to see the U.S. program in a new context, so that we can correct our weaknesses and take advantage of our strengths.

The War in Vietnam, VIII—Rickshaw Ride Is No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the eighth in a series of the report by Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on his tour of Vietnam.

Part VIII, which appeared in the Courier-Express on February 28, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, VIII—RICKSHAW RIDE IS NO BARGAIN

(NOTE.—Saigon, command post of a thoroughly 20th century war, is an old city that retains many of its quaint Asian customs. One of these is the rickshaw, that ancient survey with the fringe on top whose human "horse" have been swindling the gullible for centuries. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, gets taken for a ride by one of these picturesque pirates.)

SAIGON.—Coverage of the war in Vietnam is strewn with obstacles, not all of the Vietcong making.

On a Sunday afternoon in Saigon, another Department of Defense-sponsored newsmen Herbert Brubaker, and I decided that now would be a good time to get the Buddhist point of view. The Buddhists are thoroughly mixed up in Vietnamese politics and have contributed more than their share of instability to the government.

NOT DISSUADED

A U.S. Embassy man tried to dissuade us, saying that Sunday was just as much a day of rest for the Buddhist as it is for the

Christian. But he said that with good luck we might find someone who would talk with us at the Buddhist Institute on Tran Quoc Toan Avenue.

We took a chance and set off on our mission.

It was a beautiful day and it seemed like a good idea at the time to hire two rickshaws to taxi us to our destination.

INSTRUCTIONS

A Saigon policeman who seemed to know a little English was told where we wanted to go and instructed the rickshaw operators. Asked how much we should pay our drivers, the policeman said 10 piastres apiece.

A piastre is worth about 14 cents, and the fare seemed reasonable.

So we set off on our merry way, up one street and down another, dallying not long on Dal Lo Le Lo Boulevard, or Gia Long Street, and not even getting hung up on Hong Thap Tu Road, despite fierce traffic.

TROUBLES START

We arrived soon at what we thought was the institute and our troubles began. The rickshaw drivers squealed their displeasure at the proffered 10 piastres, so reluctantly and foolishly we tossed them five more apiece—7 cents more to buy a little peace. It not only brought peace but the drivers amiably conducted us on a tour of the place.

It was a beautiful place. All the rich trappings of a pagoda—Buddha with the many arms, incense, teakwood, jade, and the kneeling devout—were on view.

Come to find out, however, it was a pagoda and not the Buddhist Institute. Laboriously we searched up and down for someone who could speak and read a little English, and after about 10 minutes found one who told our rickshaw friends that the place we wanted to go to was on Tran Quoc Toan Avenue.

OFF AGAIN

It's highly possible that those sly little rascals knew all along they had taken us to the wrong place, and it would have been well for us at this point to have hired one of the metered motorcabs.

But Confucius say there's no fool like an occidental fool, or he ought to have said it. Anyway, we clambered aboard again and were off.

As near as I could later make out from a map, we got to Tran Quoc Toan Avenue via Chua Huyen Tran, Ba Huyen Thank Quang, Phan Dinh Phung, and Phan Thank Giang Streets but I'm a little uncertain that was the precise route.

MORE DEMANDS

It is fair to State, I guess, that we planned out all over the city, so long did it take to arrive at our destination.

This time, it seems, we finally had arrived at the Buddhist Institute and now came a haggling by our rickshaw drivers that would have made Shylock green with envy.

Those oriental thieves wanted 50 piastres apiece. In vain we argued and shouted. The more we argued the greater grew the crowd.

It might well have turned into a street riot, hence we paid off.

It took 20 minutes to find someone who spoke English at the institute. At this point we learned that the U.S. Embassy man was right, no official at the institute was present.

"Come back last week," said a man in broken English, who was scornfully corrected by another who suggested we try in 2 days.

SWITCH TO CAB

We were, however, not so foolish as to play the rickshaw roulette game on the way back.

We hired a small metered cab and for a grand total of only 20 piastres, including tip, we were back in our hotel in nothing flat.

We had not gained the slightest knowledge of Buddhist politics and, considering our

total outlay of time and money, the afternoon could only be considered as most plastrous.

Tribute to Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, First Woman Chief of Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the proposed creation of a new Cabinet post in the field of housing and urban affairs, attention has been focused on the importance of having qualified, imaginative, and responsible authorities in the public housing field.

I wish to commend Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, our Nation's first woman chief of public housing, for her work and success in this field. Mrs. McGuire has a long history of accomplishments in public housing, which has earned her a citation from the American Institute of Architects.

As a tribute to this fine person, I ask unanimous consent that an article concerning her, from the Dallas Morning News of February 24, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Feb. 24, 1965]

HOUSING CHIEF BATTLES DRAB DESIGN—HAS GOOD WORD FOR DALLAS

(By Mary Brinkerhoff)

The Nation's first woman chief of public housing was back in Texas Tuesday, still a free-form, split-level, multi-purpose model built to stand out on Washington's official skyline.

Mrs. Marie C. McGuire walked off a Braniff Airways plane into Dallas' suddenly roaring winter and talked a while on everything from local housing proposals to her war against drab design.

Then she was off for several speaking engagements in Fort Worth with Thomas H. Callahan, the Public Housing Authority's regional director there, and his assistant, E. J. Haling.

She was shown a newspaper report of the recent Dallas Council of Social Agencies recommendation that at least 1,000 one-bedroom apartments for the elderly be built under Dallas Housing Authority auspices.

This kind of thing is her meat. When Mrs. McGuire was executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority, her pioneering apartment project for older people won her fame and a Federal appointment.

For those who doubt the need of low income housing for the aged, she offers this thought: When such housing is built in a city of any size, applicants outnumber available units many times over.

Private "retirement villas" are fine, she believes, but they have little bearing on the problem which concerns her. "The difficulty is that they are not speaking to the majority's ability to pay."

Marie McGuire, famed as a redtape slasher during her nearly 4 years in Washington, never lost her concern for the individual, elderly or otherwise, who lives in public housing.

She hasn't been overawed by her responsibility for Federal participation in a program

which operates in more than 2,100 communities and represents a total investment running into billions.

And she retains a soft spot for her Victoria Plaza in San Antonio, still a showpiece. It was designed with thought for the occupants need for beauty, recreation, friendship—factors to make them feel that "life is not over; it may be just beginning."

Any resident of public housing, she's convinced, should be able to take pride in his home. And while "I'm all for economy," drabness and poor design are false economies to her.

"After all, we're building environments to last for the next 50 to 100 years."

A corollary is that public housing shouldn't be segregated in some grim location. "It should meld in with the community, not stand off in the backyards * * *. You have some good public housing sites in Dallas, in very pleasant parts of the city. This is not true of some cities."

Mrs. McGuire strongly opposes housing plans which segregate the handicapped, those of lowest income or any group as if they were "the dregs of society."

One way around such segregation was provided in the Housing Act of 1961: partnership between the Public Housing Authority and private enterprise.

An example is under construction in New York by the PHA and a foundation. Five hundred units will be reserved for "low-income" occupants, another 500 for those of "lower middle" income. The two kinds of tenants will be mixed throughout.

When an occupant's income rises or falls, he changes status—and, in a sense, landlords—through a mere bookkeeping switch. He doesn't have to move, and if the change is downward, he isn't stigmatized.

Mrs. McGuire's office receives many inquiries about this system, which has proved a boon to private builders as well as to tenants.

Also, she observed, the plan "takes a little of the sting off" for people who just can't swallow the concept of federally financed housing.

The PHA Commissioner reminds these people that her agency's participation in a housing project doesn't mean Federal supervision. "Congress is well aware of controls at the local level."

She explains the PHA's role this way: "We, in effect, are the bankers. And any prudent banker certainly watches his investment."

Home rule applies in the matter of design, unless a proposal is downright extravagant. "I'm running on a platform of design freedom. Truly, the area of housing is going to reflect what each city wants."

When a community needs help or advice on design, Mrs. McGuire can call on her blue-ribbon panel of professional consultants. She has set aside the agency's old design manuals as influences toward conformity.

For such measures and for her general attitude, she was cited by the American Institute of Architects.

When her powers of persuasion fail, local control sometimes pains her. She couldn't keep a certain city from building "one of those round, tubelike towers" with pie-slice efficiency apartments for the elderly.

"I lost that battle."

Lewis Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending

warm congratulations to the Parliamentarian of the House, Lewis Deschler, on his birthday.

Lew Deschler has been a familiar figure in the Chamber of the House for almost 40 years. He had already earned the respect and high regard of all the Members when I first came to the House. Since that time his stature has continued to grow. As Parliamentarian he has exercised great objectivity and judgment in his advice to the Speaker on the numerous intricate problems of procedure that constantly arise in this body. During his tenure as Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler has rendered invaluable assistance to the Speaker, regardless of party affiliation, and to Members on both sides of the aisle.

I wish for Lew Deschler many happy returns of the day.

We Can Win in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 9, 1965, issue of National Review includes a very interesting article by a distinguished South Carolina newsmen, Anthony Harrigan, of Charleston. The article, entitled "We Can Win in Southeast Asia," notes that this is a report from a firsthand observer who found that Americans fighting in southeast Asia do not agree with defeatists at home who say we must get out because we cannot win. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE CAN WIN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(A firsthand observer found that Americans fighting in southeast Asia do not agree with defeatists at home who say we must get out because we can't win).

As long ago as 1963, the New Republic was saying: "The war in South Vietnam cannot be won." More recently, Walter Lippmann, the oracle of retreat, solemnly declared: "Nobody in his right mind can imagine that this kind of war can be won." Prof. Bernard B. Fall, author of "Ordeal at Dienbienphu," and "The Two Vietnams," lends his authority to the statement that "any lingering idea that the Vietnam war can be ended by the surrender of the Communists is totally unrealistic."

The chorus of defeatism is loud in the land. Bearded young beatniks march with signs asserting the hopelessness of the struggle against the Vietcong. Clergymen and teachers of international relations write letters to the editors of the New York Times, declaring how fortunate the United States will be if Ho Chi Minh agrees to negotiate the establishment of a Yugoslav-type Communist state in a united Vietnam.

On the south China Sea, in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam, and on the airfields of southeast Asia, there are strong views to the contrary. "We can win" is the overwhelming opinion of the Americans who are fighting the war in Vietnam. This confidence is shared by senior commanders at

home and overseas. But the professional soldier no longer is free, as he was in the 1950's, to state his case to the Nation. Unfortunately, no Senator has been as busy and articulate in explaining why the United States can win in Asia as Senator WAYNE MORSE has been in stating the case for capitulation and withdrawal.

Nevertheless, the evidence exists to support those who believe that an American victory is possible in southeast Asia. We have the ships. We have the planes. We have the weapons. All that is required for victory is firm leadership, historical understanding, and a resolute people.

The U.S. public need pay no attention to the Lippmann nonsense that Americans can't win a war in Asia. Only 20 years ago the United States defeated a superbly organized, brilliantly led Asian adversary. There's nothing magical about the soil of Asia. If the United States has the right weapons, the proper strategy, and the will to win, it will triumph in Asia as it has elsewhere on the globe.

The truth is that we have hardly begun to fight in Asia. But fight we must or, in the fullness of time, Chinese-led guerrillas will be in Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula or across the Rio Grande.

An American victory in southeast Asia is a meaningless concept apart from a vision of history. The Vietcong is but an advanced guard of a resurgent Chinese Empire. In centuries past, the Vietnam region was one of China's tributary states. The Middle Kingdom's power extended to Java and to Ceylon, and the great eunuch admiral, Cheng Ho, had led fleets as far as east Africa in the 15th century. China's history was arrested by the European states, and its own inner decay. But with the failure of nerve on the part of many once great Western nations, China again is reaching out—pushing southward into Vietnam, with Australia as the ultimate goal to the south; aiming, with its nibbling at India's frontier, to reach the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean, and planning to extend and deepen its influence from the Congo to Somalia and from the Yemen to Albania.

Such is the vast scope of the Chinese vision of conquest. If the United States is to prevent its fulfillment, the American people and Government must clearly understand the nature of the struggle in which they are involved and its long-term perspective. The struggle in Vietnam is not an isolated conflict, which can be settled by a tidy accord in which unpleasant truths can be brushed under a mass of legalistic documents. Vietnam is a key military campaign in the containment of Communist China and the reduction of its power. Our national purpose can be nothing less than that of suppressing China's warmaking capacity and, by the force of our retaliatory assaults, convincing Peiping that a southward course of empire is too costly and dangerous. If Communist China's leaders are compelled to look northward, toward the empty lands of the former Chinese Empire that now are in Soviet Russia's hands, all the better.

Obviously, a tit-for-tat policy of light retaliatory raids will not force Peiping to any fundamental change in its policies. A far more comprehensive and massive assault will be needed, over a long period of time.

The United States needs to recognize, to begin with, that the problems in southeast Asia are essentially military, not political. This conclusion is completely contrary to the ruling doctrine in the Department of State; but even the most deeply rooted doctrine can be altered by the facts. What makes the Vietcong a force in the countryside is not its doctrine, but the fact that its doctrine is supported by arms in the hands of terrorists. Mao Tse-tung once said that the gun is the ultimate political weapon. Only in this sense is the southeast Asian struggle basically political.

which operates in more than 2,100 communities and represents a total investment running into billions.

And she retains a soft spot for her Victoria Plaza in San Antonio, still a showpiece. It was designed with thought for the occupants need for beauty, recreation, friendship—factors to make them feel that "life is not over; it may be just beginning."

Any resident of public housing, she's convinced, should be able to take pride in his home. And while "I'm all for economy," drabness and poor design are false economies to her.

"After all, we're building environments to last for the next 50 to 100 years."

A corollary is that public housing shouldn't be segregated in some grim location. "It should meld in with the community, not stand off in the backyards . . . You have some good public housing sites in Dallas, in very pleasant parts of the city. This is not true of some cities."

Mrs. McGuire strongly opposes housing plans which segregate the handicapped, those of lowest income or any group as if they were "the dregs of society."

One way around such segregation was provided in the Housing Act of 1961: partnership between the Public Housing Authority and private enterprise.

An example is under construction in New York by the PHA and a foundation. Five hundred units will be reserved for "low-income" occupants, another 500 for those of "lower middle" income. The two kinds of tenants will be mixed throughout.

When an occupant's income rises or falls, he changes status—and, in a sense, landlords—through a mere bookkeeping switch. He doesn't have to move, and if the change is downward, he isn't stigmatized.

Mrs. McGuire's office receives many inquiries about this system, which has proved a boon to private builders as well as to tenants.

Also, she observed, the plan "takes a little of the sting off" for people who just can't swallow the concept of federally financed housing.

The PHA Commissioner reminds these people that her agency's participation in a housing project doesn't mean Federal supervision. "Congress is well aware of controls at the local level."

She explains the PHA's role this way: "We, in effect, are the bankers. And any prudent banker certainly watches his investment."

Home rule applies in the matter of design, unless a proposal is downright extravagant. "I'm running on a platform of design freedom. Truly, the area of housing is going to reflect what each city wants."

When a community needs help or advice on design, Mrs. McGuire can call on her blue-ribbon panel of professional consultants. She has set aside the agency's old design manuals as influences toward conformity.

For such measures and for her general attitude, she was cited by the American Institute of Architects.

When her powers of persuasion fail, local control sometimes pains her. She couldn't keep a certain city from building "one of those round, tubelike towers" with pie-slice efficiency apartments for the elderly.

"I lost that battle."

Lewis Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending

warm congratulations to the Parliamentarian of the House, Lewis Deschler, on his birthday.

Lew Deschler has been a familiar figure in the Chamber of the House for almost 40 years. He had already earned the respect and high regard of all the Members when I first came to the House. Since that time his stature has continued to grow. As Parliamentarian he has exercised great objectivity and judgment in his advice to the Speaker on the numerous intricate problems of procedure that constantly arise in this body. During his tenure as Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler has rendered invaluable assistance to the Speaker, regardless of party affiliation, and to Members on both sides of the aisle.

I wish for Lew Deschler many happy returns of the day.

We Can Win in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 9, 1965, issue of National Review includes a very interesting article by a distinguished South Carolina newsman, Anthony Harrigan, of Charleston. The article, entitled "We Can Win in Southeast Asia," notes that this is a report from a firsthand observer who found that Americans fighting in southeast Asia do not agree with defeatists at home who say we must get out because we cannot win. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE CAN WIN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(A firsthand observer found that Americans fighting in southeast Asia do not agree with defeatists at home who say we must get out because we can't win.)

As long ago as 1963, the New Republic was saying: "The war in South Vietnam cannot be won." More recently, Walter Lippmann, the oracle of retreat, solemnly declared: "Nobody in his right mind can imagine that this kind of war can be 'won.'" Prof. Bernard B. Fall, author of "Ordeal at Dien Bien Phu," and "The Two Vietnams," lends his authority to the statement that "any lingering idea that the Vietnam war can be ended by the surrender of the Communists is totally unrealistic."

The chorus of defeatism is loud in the land. Bearded young beatniks march with signs asserting the hopelessness of the struggle against the Vietcong. Clergymen and teachers of international relations write letters to the editors of the New York Times, declaring how fortunate the United States will be if Ho Chi Minh agrees to negotiate the establishment of a Yugoslav-type Communist state in a united Vietnam.

On the south China Sea, in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam, and on the airfields of southeast Asia, there are strong views to the contrary. "We can win" is the overwhelming opinion of the Americans who are fighting the war in Vietnam. This confidence is shared by senior commanders at

home and overseas. But the professional soldier no longer is free, as he was in the 1950's, to state his case to the Nation. Unfortunately, no Senator has been as busy and articulate in explaining why the United States can win in Asia as Senator Warren Moskau has been in stating the case for capitulation and withdrawal.

Nevertheless, the evidence exists to support those who believe that an American victory is possible in southeast Asia. We have the ships. We have the planes. We have the weapons. All that is required for victory is firm leadership, historical understanding, and a resolute people.

The U.S. public need pay no attention to the Lippmann nonsense that Americans can't win a war in Asia. Only 20 years ago the United States defeated a superbly organized, brilliantly led Asian adversary. There's nothing magical about the soil of Asia. If the United States has the right weapons, the proper strategy, and the will to win, it will triumph in Asia as it has elsewhere on the globe.

The truth is that we have hardly begun to fight in Asia. But fight we must or, in the fullness of time, Chinese-led guerrillas will be in Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula or across the Rio Grande.

An American victory in southeast Asia is a meaningless concept apart from a vision of history. The Vietcong is but an advanced guard of a resurgent Chinese Empire. In centuries past, the Vietnam region was one of China's tributary states. The Middle Kingdom's power extended to Java and to Ceylon, and the great eunuch admiral, Cheng Ho, had led fleets as far as east Africa in the 16th century. China's history was arrested by the European states, and its own inner decay. But with the failure of nerve on the part of many once great Western nations, China again is reaching out—pushing southward into Vietnam, with Australia as the ultimate goal to the south; aiming, with its nibbling at India's frontier, to reach the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean, and planning to extend and deepen its influence from the Congo to Somalia and from the Yemen to Albania.

Such is the vast scope of the Chinese vision of conquest. If the United States is to prevent its fulfillment, the American people and Government must clearly understand the nature of the struggle in which they are involved and its long-term perspective. The struggle in Vietnam is not an isolated conflict, which can be settled by a tidy accord in which unpleasant truths can be brushed under a mass of legalistic documents. Vietnam is a key military campaign in the containment of Communist China, and the reduction of its power. Our national purpose can be nothing less than that of suppressing China's war-making capability and, by the force of our retaliatory assaults, convincing Peiping that a southward course of empire is too costly and dangerous. If Communist China's leaders are compelled to look northward, toward the empty lands of the former Chinese Empire that now are in Soviet Russia's hands, all the better.

Obviously, a tit-for-tat policy of light retaliatory raids will not force Peiping to any fundamental change in its policies. A far more comprehensive and massive assault will be needed, over a long period of time.

The United States needs to recognize, to begin with, that the problems in southeast Asia are essentially military, not political. This conclusion is completely contrary to the ruling doctrine in the Department of State; but even the most deeply rooted doctrine can be altered by the facts. What makes the Vietcong a force in the countryside is not its doctrine, but the fact that its doctrine is supported by arms in the hands of terrorists. Mao Tse-tung once said that the gun is the ultimate political weapon. Only in this sense is the southeast Asian struggle basically political.

If the United States were activated by a conscious policy of reducing Chinese Communist power over a period of years and decades, many specific military measures could be ordered—measures short of nuclear bombardment. The spectrum of warfare is wide, and many areas on it have not even been touched by the United States.

In view of the lack of awareness in this country that the struggle with Red China may last well into the 21st century, it is unlikely that the administration—even if it were fully alert to the threat and determined to deal with it effectively—would be willing to shift overnight to the strongest techniques of dealing with the new Chinese Empire. We must assume, therefore, that the initial moves in the direction of a stronger response to China would have to be basically conventional in character. In time, air vehicles such as the Hovercraft, or air-cushion vehicles, will come into use, and add a new dimension to combat aviation and ground support. But such weaponry is not ready for field use in the near future—at least not on a large scale.

The prime area of military opportunity in South Vietnam is river warfare. Whereas roads are virtually nonexistent, or are in bad shape or dangerous for use by convoys, South Vietnam is laced with rivers. In the south, below Saigon, there is a vast network of canals built by the French. Seven river assault groups, operating small craft and armed with machineguns, automatic cannon, and a few heavy weapons, have been organized. But such groups have never received the attention they deserve. The Vietnam war effort could use many times this number of river combat groups, and the boats and weapons could be greatly improved. The Vietcong use the rivers and canals as a means of communication and supply. They terrorize the villagers who live along the streams. Yet these waterways also offer logical access to the Vietcong. They should be used to maximum advantage by the forces of freedom.

On land, Americans have become accustomed to the ways of guerrilla warfare. But we have yet, as a nation, to realize that guerrilla war can be waged on the water. The so-called junk fleet doesn't meet the need. What is required are fleets of fast small craft armed with automatic cannon, 40 mm. Bofors weapons, heavy mortars, flame-throwers, and anti-mine equipment. The rivers, coastal waters and long seaward flank of southeast Asia afford a magnificent opportunity to exert expanding sea pressure against the Communists. Unfortunately Americans have virtually forgotten about river warfare. They think of it as something out of the American Civil War or the old Yangtze patrol days in China. Yet river warfare is one of the military challenges of our time. Much of the fighting liable to take place in south Asia in the decade ahead may take place on the great rivers of the region—the Rajang in Borneo, the Salween and Irrawaddy in Burma, and the Brahmaputra in India as well as the Mekong in the Indochinese successor states. It is on the rivers that anti-Communist forces may find their most secure operational bases.

BLOCKADE: WHY NOT?

The maritime means available to our country are not limited to river fighting, however. There is heavy coastal traffic along the North Vietnamese and Chinese coasts—traffic which is of major importance to these countries, since they lack good land communications. Interdiction and offensive operations against this traffic are good ways of applying pressure against the Communist regime. Beyond this lies the instrument of the blockade—the next major means of seriously injuring the economy of either North Vietnam or Red China. If the United States seriously intends victory over the Vietcong,

which is dependent on North Vietnam, then a blockade of North Vietnam's ports should be the next item of national business. The entire complex of plants and factories around Hanoi depend on electric power. That power, and transportation in North Vietnam, in turn depend on oil that arrives by tanker. In the 7th Fleet, the United States has the means of carrying out an effective blockade. Such an action is no more an act of war, certainly, than the bombing raids, and in the long run, a blockade would be even more effective than the raids. Aerial attack can hinder a country's military and industrial operations, but a blockade can completely paralyze a nation. If, therefore, the air raids do not deter the North Vietnamese from supporting the Vietcong, then clearly a blockade should be instituted. This, more than any other military measure, would help achieve victory in Vietnam.

The United States always has to consider the possibility of Red Chinese intervention, which would greatly alter the situation. The American estimate is that a Chinese attack, if it comes, will be a three-pronged assault, with drives along the Vietnamese coast, down through Laos, and deep into Thailand via eastern Burma. Even if such an offensive is not launched in 1965 or 1966, the probability of its taking place sometime in the future is high. In a direct military confrontation with China, the United States could use nuclear weapons. But even if the decision were against using such weapons, because of pressure at home or from friends abroad, other powerful weapons exist to halt Chinese aggression. To engage Red China in a massive conventional land war would be madness, of course, because of China's colossal population.

But if China begins a direct attack, the United States should immediately resort to anticrop chemicals. The great weakness of Communist China is its inability to feed its population adequately. Anticrop chemicals are perhaps the best means we possess of curbing Peking's aggression. With superiority in airpower, the United States has the means of introducing over a large area of China those chemicals which reduce crop yields. In short, we have it within our power to impose famine upon the nation that seeks to engulf all its neighbors. Dr. Clifford F. Ragsweller, former president of the Industrial Research Institute, recently urged that the United States review the effectiveness of such weapons. Referring to Vietnam, he said: "But suppose we could destroy all vegetation and prevent regrowth for the crop years in the areas which form the hard core of Vietcong strength. The Vietcong installations and activity would be exposed. The Vietcong could no longer live on local crops."

Even so brief a survey shows that the United States has many options available in the military field, ranging from the orthodox to the unorthodox. Each and all of them, if exercised, would bring forth protests engineered by the Communists on a global scale. The domestic and foreign protests evoked by a few retaliatory air raids are evidence of what lies in the future if the administration presses for defeat of the Vietcong and a sharp cutback in Red China's power.

Inasmuch as the United States has refrained from many available military measures, it is clearly absurd for any responsible person to say, on the record up to now, that the United States cannot win in Vietnam. The United States, with its vast technological and military resources, cannot be defeated by weak Asian powers—not on the battlefield. If we are defeated in Vietnam and elsewhere in Asia, we will be defeated in our own minds. We will have allowed the Communists to break our will to win. If we possess the will to win, victory will follow on the battlefields and on the high seas.

The 100th Anniversary of the Committee on Appropriations

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Appropriations.

In his remarks he referred to his predecessors as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations collectively and to several of them individually and by name. It is my pleasure to refer to GEORGE MAHON by name and to add that the luster which was attached to those 23 chairmen who preceded him has been preserved and made brighter by the addition of him to that group.

When he became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in May 1964, he succeeded to this position with a background of 29 years' experience and service in the House of Representatives, of which are included 26 years of service as a member of this committee.

He presides over this committee with dignity, fairness, and a deep sense of responsibility to the Congress and the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the Georgians who have served on this committee. During the first 100 years, 11 Representatives from Georgia have been elected to membership on the Committee on Appropriations.

The first Georgian to so serve was Representative James H. Blount, of Macon, who represented a part of the area which now comprises the Sixth District of Georgia. Representative Blount became a member of the Committee on Appropriations in 1875 and served until his voluntary retirement in 1881.

In this connection it is interesting to note that 4 of the 11 Georgians whose congressional service has included membership on the Committee on Appropriations represented all or part of the present Sixth District of Georgia. In addition to Representative Blount, these include Representative Charles L. Bartlett, of Macon, Representative William C. Wright, of Newnan, and the Member who now addresses the House.

The list of Georgia Representatives who have so served and the period of the respective service of each is as follows:

James H. Blount, Macon, 1875-81.

Judson C. Clements, Rome, 1887-91.

Leonidas F. Livingston, Kings, 1891-1911.

Charles L. Bartlett, Macon, 1911-15.

William Schley Howard, Kirkwood, 1915-19.

me. But now I think I can demonstrate something of more general interest.

As John Dewey used to put it, the ultimate function of literature is to appreciate the world, sometimes indignantly, sometimes sorrowfully, but best of all to praise when it is luckily possible. My experience of the Hudson River, its grandeur and loveliness and degradation, its vicissitudes even during my 50 years, has given me much to be indignant about, and grieve, and praise. But it is also the case, as Dewey also pointed out, that poetic appreciation has consequences, in personal behavior and social action. It awakens, in self and others, a frame of mind in which something must be done, prevented, remedied, protected, improved. My own primary literary activity of appreciation has certainly had this effect on me, and maybe I have even influenced others.

The scenes of grandeur and beauty that work on a child's mind bring into being all the glory that our society will ever achieve. Where else is "vision" to come from? I think we all know this, but we are damned careless about it. We are intensely worried about the children passing their school examinations and getting good grades and being trained to get jobs with good salaries; yet we are astoundingly unconcerned about what music they listen to, what the streets look like and feel like, and whether the children have access to the river.

We find, on inquiry, that the average kid brought up today in a depressed neighborhood will have reached the age of 12 and 13 and never have been 10 blocks from home, never have seen anything beautiful. What do you think of that?

GREAT RIVER OF THE MOUNTAINS

The Hudson River—named for explorer Henry Hudson, although he called it the "great river of the mountains"—rises high on Mount Marcy in the Adirondacks, absorbs a number of tributaries, chiefly the Mohawk, and flows for 315 miles southward to New York Bay. Its lower half, some 150 miles from Albany to the sea, is actually an estuary of the ocean where tides ebb and flow and the water is salt or brackish.

About 50 miles above New York, the Hudson Valley is a narrow gorge flanked by steep mountains—Storm King, Breakneck, Mount Taurus, Bear Mountain, Dunderberg, Anthony's Nose, High Tor, Prickly Pear Hill. Then it opens to its broadest, Haverstraw Bay, some 3½ miles across, and the Tappan Zee, almost as wide. Below this it narrows again as it flows along the New Jersey Palisades, sheer cliffs that in places rise more than 500 feet above the water.

Where it washes Manhattan, the Hudson is often called the North River, for it is the way to the north. From the earliest colonial times it has been a vital commercial waterway, made yet more so when the Erie Canal linked it with the Great Lakes. In its fast-flowing upper reaches, above tidewater, it has long been harnessed for power.

New York's first atomic powerplant stands beside the middle Hudson at Indian Point, near Peekskill. Now a hotly debated proposal is to put a powerplant on Storm King, to pump Hudson water up to a mountaintop reservoir at times of low demand and let it flow back through turbine generators to meet peak demands. The power company says the plant won't harm the great river's scenic or recreation qualities; opponents say it will.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I wish also to take this opportunity to thank my colleague [Mr. JAVITS], who has been so helpful in the introduction of the proposed legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The introduction of this bill is an example of the fact that Senators from the same State—whatever may be their party affiliation, generally—close ranks when it comes to an intrastate problem and one relating to development and beautification in that State. I believe that is an excellent practice.

I am pleased to have been able to join my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] in the introduction of the proposed legislation. I know that it represented a considerable effort and some little time on his part to meet some of my views part of the way so that we could join and get the added strength which comes from bipartisan action. I am very pleased to see it, and I express the hope that it is auspicious for similar efforts in other matters. There are many areas where such action is necessary for almost any activity of the Federal Establishment directly affects New York.

I should like to say one added word about the measure, which was the subject of an additional statement which I issued, and which my colleague was kind enough to issue with his own.

The State of New York is deeply interested in this matter. That does not mean that our views and those of the State will necessarily be the same. For example, a difference of view has developed on the building of a powerplant along the shores of the Hudson, application for which is now pending before the Federal Power Commission. I am as concerned as my colleague not only for ourselves, but for all America about the fact that whatever happens, there should be no harm or damage of an irremediable character to the beauty of this superbly scenic area.

In the main, the Hudson River Valley is within the limits of the State of New York. Though we are somewhat disturbed and troubled by what has happened in connection with the Palisades, which are in New Jersey, the main part of the river which is so beautiful and its banks occur within the State of New York. Therefore, there is an opportunity, and I believe a real responsibility, for the State of New York to do a good deal about this itself. The State has indicated that it is getting ready to do this, perhaps by the designation of a permanent State commission.

But I have felt that we ought to get started, and that as the Federal interest is very clear, as was shown, for example, by the Fire Island bill, which has since become law, and represented something of the same kind of effort to preserve a naturally beautiful area. I believe that we should launch a Federal effort, which looks auspicious, and that we should then say to the State—which I now do—"Come along and show us what you can or will do, so that you may fit into the the pattern of the ultimate objective, which is the preservation of the beauty of this great area."

I reserve, with the entire acquiescence of my junior colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the right to seek to amend the bill if the State should desire to participate in an effort to carry out

its responsibility and its functions; because I believe in the philosophy of government known as the Lincolnian belief or the Lincolnian theory, which should dominate my party. The essence of that philosophy is that when a State cannot do for itself as well or at all what needs to be done in the interest of the whole Nation, the Nation itself must do it.

In this instance, I do not favor delay. That is why I have joined, currently, in the bill introduced by the junior Senator from New York. Neither do I favor waiting on the State in an improper way. But I am for saying to the State, "By all means, you are not barred merely because we have introduced proposed legislation. We would like to see your plan work together with you."

There is no reason why there should not be a Federal-State project. Other elements of the Government may join together in order to achieve a great objective, to preserve a national treasure, even though it may be located within a single State. We have seen such action taken in the Western States with respect to our national parks.

So I welcome the move of the junior Senator from New York, and I join in it. I merely point out that it still is possible to accommodate a concomitant State initiative within the framework of the plan. That is the main reason why I reserve the privilege—perhaps the Senator would even join me in it if the occasion were right, for I do not believe we differ as to the fundamental philosophy—to revise the bill and reshape it to suit, what I very much invite, the added action and added initiative on the part of the State of New York, which seems to be coming to fruition. For that we should, therefore, leave the door wide open.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank my senior colleague. I shall be glad to join him in these efforts. I appreciate his remarks, which have been helpful and pertinent.

EXCELLENCE OF APPOINTMENTS, HALLMARK OF L.B.J. ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has the biggest, toughest job in the world. He is the Nation's leader in national affairs and foreign policy. He has vast and complicated administrative duties. His is the heaviest responsibility in our Government for designing, proposing, and fighting for a congressional program.

Contributing to the performance of all of his duties is the nature, the strength, or the weakness of his appointments to the top positions in the Federal Government.

What about the Johnson appointments? How do we appraise them? Recently, Jerry Klutts, the Washington Post expert on the civil service, has written of the remarkable record of President Johnson in making appointments. He writes that the President probably has given the greatest recognition of any President in history to appointing people who have a strong, solid, proven rec-

March 4

4092

ord of service in the Federal Government. This is an extraordinary tribute.

Mr. Kluttz has not written in the form of simple generalizations to praise the President, but on the basis of a careful analysis and evaluation of the appointments that have been made.

Mr. Kluttz also writes:

Despite the great pressures on him, the President has found time to interview personally most of the candidates before their appointments are announced in public. He tries to spend at least 30 minutes with each appointee to give him an opportunity to know him and to exchange views.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in full by Mr. Kluttz be printed in this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY: JOHNSON RATES HIS APPOINTEES ON WORK IN FEDERAL SERVICE
(By Jerry Kluttz)

An amazing 51 percent of the 120 personal appointments made by President Johnson during the 15 months he has been in office have been either career civil servants or persons with wide backgrounds of Federal service.

No other President has given such broad recognition to professional experience in the art of government. In fact, nearly all of the Johnson appointees have had some experience in the Federal service.

Despite the great pressures on him, the President has found time to interview personally most of the candidates before their appointments are announced to the public. He tries to spend at least 30 minutes with each appointee to give him an opportunity to know him and to exchange views.

"These people," an assistant explained, "are personal appointees of the President who is responsible for them. The President will be either credited or discredited for their acts. He looks to them to carry out his programs and policies. He wants to be absolutely certain of them and where they stand before he asks the Senate to confirm them."

The President has made clear that key appointments to Defense, State, and similarly sensitive agencies are to be made on the basis of merit and ability. Political considerations are secondary.

Mr. Johnson has been heard to remark that no one checks on the politics of our troops in Vietnam and that their superiors here should be equally nonpartisan and should base their decisions on what's good for the American public.

He also has told his associates to recommend to him only those persons for regulatory agencies who will be fair and firm in upholding the interest of the public. He's reluctant to appoint anyone who is a representative of a group or special interest. In fact, he prefers to have appointees who aren't labeled one way or the other and who have open minds on agency problems and policies.

Only a few of what are generally considered political appointments have been made by the President who, in effect, has told his top staff to do their jobs and leave partisan politics to him.

Only three of the nine Cabinet members—Secretaries Udall, of Interior, and Freeman, of Agriculture, and Postmaster General Gronouski—have political backgrounds. Each was appointed originally by President Kennedy.

President Johnson is widely regarded as being a master politician but he frequently refers to himself as a "career Government employee." He has 33 years of Federal service, which is nearly all of his adult life.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY also is considered a career Government employee by the President. He has more than 20 years or city, State, and Federal service.

Chairman John W. Macy of the Civil Service Commission, recently gave the Vice President a 20-year service pin. Three years ago he gave a 30-year pin to Mr. Johnson.

The President no doubt looks to the career service for a record number of key appointments because they are the people he knows best. He also must think that their thorough knowledge of the Federal service will result in good administration that will reflect credit on him and the Democratic Party.

STANDARDS AND QUALITIES OF BROADCASTING NEWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, much has been written and spoken about the standards and qualities of broadcasting news. In 1964 the Radio-Television News Directors Association conducted a conference on the problem of establishing standards for television news film reporting at a station level. As a consequence of this conference, a television newsfilm standards manual was prepared. This is a guidebook and working manual for students and professionals in the news film area. Because of the interest in this subject, I have prepared a summary of the factors leading up to the adoption of this manual:

In September of 1963, the management of Time-Life Broadcast made this suggestion to the board of directors of the Radio-Television News Directors Association:

In the belief that a real need exists for the establishment of a set of standards for television newsfilm reporting at the station level, Time-Life Broadcast suggests to the RTNDA that a joint project, designed to satisfy that need, should be undertaken.

It was undertaken. In February-March of 1964, the RTNDA Newsfilm Standards Conference was held in the Time & Life Building, New York City, attended by 230 delegates. Represented were 94 television stations in 37 states, 7 universities, and 29 other organizations vitally interested in newsfilm technique. A faculty of 21 recognized experts made presentations and conducted discussions.

This conference was the first attempt ever made to establish standards in this all-important field of public information and communication. Never before had so many top experts in our field come together to communicate to their peers what their actual experience has taught them. The professional appraisal of practical—sometimes difficult—problems, the clash and exchange of ideas, the candid, constructive criticism of current inadequacies, all made this not just another conference but a seminal event of major importance to all who are dedicated to television newsfilm excellence. This book, which puts the results of the conferences in permanent form, is designed to help you see your chosen field in broader perspective and to be of workaday benefit to you in your particular job. It is also designed to accommodate material on future advancements in technique and execution as they are made in laboratory and studio.

Mr. Edward F. Ryan, the president of the Radio-Television News Directors Association, "Time-Life" broadcast, and all those responsible for the conference and the development of the standards should be commended for their efforts and accomplishments.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE CONTINUING FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, having spoken at length on the subject of Vietnam last week, I have been reluctant to take the floor again. However, a number of statements have been made on the floor of the Senate and from other platforms in recent weeks which, in my opinion, call for comment.

I first wish to comment on the remarks made last week by Secretary-General U Thant, because in point of time his was the first of several statements on Vietnam which, I feel, should be answered in order to set the record straight.

In his press conference of February 24, Secretary-General U Thant was quoted as saying the following:

I am sure that the great American people, if only they know the true facts and the background to the developments in South Vietnam, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary. The political and diplomatic method of discussions and negotiations alone can create conditions which will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world.

A statement was subsequently issued attempting to explain and soften the impact of the Secretary-General's press conference of February 24. It is my belief, however, that the language used by the Secretary-General on February 24 was of the kind that cannot be explained away.

I have been a strong supporter of the United Nations since its inception. In my years in Congress—now going into the 11th year—I have voted in support of every appropriation requested for the U.N. and its various agencies. Despite my opposition to the U.N. military actions in Katanga, I voted for support of U.S. participation in the U.N. bond issue in August of 1962, because it was clear that the survival of the U.N. was at stake. Indeed, I think it not improper to point out that participation in the U.N. bond issue was approved in the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which I am privileged to serve, by the perilous margin of one vote.

As a supporter of the U.N., I am concerned over its diminishing effectiveness and prestige; and I, therefore, feel impelled to speak with the utmost frankness about the unfortunate partiality the Secretary-General has displayed on this issue and other issues.

U Thant's gratuitous advice to the American people and his suggestion that their Government has concealed the true facts from them would be reason for resentment coming from any source.

But coming from the Secretary General of the United Nations, his remarks showed a complete lack of the restraint and objectivity which should be the hall-

marks of his position. His advice to the United States was all the more offensive because the record will demonstrate that he has failed to comment or offer advice of any kind in dealing with the repeated acts of aggression by certain Afro-Asian nations.

For example, he had no comment on the forcible annexation of Goa by India, in clear violation of the U.N. Charter. I am not finding fault with Goa's being incorporated into the nation of India; but it was clearly a violation of the United Nations Charter to accomplish that by naked aggression. Yet Mr. U Thant, who now gives us advice, never said one word about that act of naked aggression.

He has failed to urge Indonesia to cease its aggression against Malaysia. There has not been word from him on that subject.

Nor has he suggested to Prime Minister Nasser that he withdraw the 50,000 Egyptian troops which are now occupying Yemen so that the Yemeni people may decide their own future without foreign intervention.

As the representative of the National Government of Yemen has aptly pointed out, the Secretary General has kept silent about the situation in Yemen although he was responsible for a U.N. mission to Yemen set up to supervise Nasser's promised withdrawal from that country.

He has maintained his silence despite the fact that for 14 months Nasser bombed and killed Yemeni citizens before the eyes of U Thant's observers, and that, instead of withdrawing his forces, Nasser has during this period almost doubled their strength, so that they now approximate 50,000 men. There has not been a word from Mr. U Thant on that subject.

I, as one American, wholeheartedly subscribe to the suggestion of the Yemeni representative that the Secretary General get Nasser out of Yemen and tell the great Egyptian people "the true facts and background of the situation in Yemen," which are now being concealed from them by their own government.

In their overwhelming majority, the American people believe in the U.N. and in the objectives to which it is dedicated. But they rightly expect of the U.N., and especially of the man entrusted with the responsibility of Secretary General, a fair and judicious attitude.

They do not expect him to sponsor a position which completely ignores the fact of Communist aggression and which would inevitably lead to a Communist takeover in Vietnam.

The American press has justly been critical of the position taken by the Secretary General. In the interest of the good name of the U.N., it is my earnest hope that the Secretary General will benefit from this experience.

In the course of the debate on Vietnam in the Senate this week and on several previous occasions, it has been suggested that we try to extricate ourselves from Vietnam by turning the entire problem over to the United Nations. As much as I would like to see the peace-keeping role of the United Nations strengthened

and expanded, I believe that this proposal is completely unrealistic in view of the United Nations' present situation.

It ignores the fact that the United Nations is in such strained financial circumstances that even its Palestine refugee operation is in jeopardy.

It ignores the fact that we have thus far not been able to find any way of compelling the Soviet Union, France, and other countries to live up to their past financial obligations or to contribute to future operations of which they disapprove.

It ignores the dangerous shift within the United Nations, a shift which has now given the Afro-Asian nations and the Communist bloc nations the power, if they vote in concert, to prevent any action by the U.N., even when there has been an open violation of the U.N. Charter as in the case of India's invasion of Goa.

It ignores the condition of near paralysis that now afflicts the U.N. in consequence of the deadlock on the issue of continued voting rights for those whose arrears exceed the limits prescribed in article 19.

And, finally, even if all these difficulties did not exist, the recommendation that the problem of Vietnam be turned over to the United Nations becomes preposterous in the face of the declared attitude of the Secretary General, U Thant.

Let us have no illusions on this score: no matter how desirable such a solution might be in theory, there is absolutely no way in which we can disembarass ourselves of Vietnam by turning it over to the United Nations now.

We must face up to this problem ourselves, acting in consort with our Vietnamese allies, with the free nations in the area, and with those Western nations who are prepared to assume their share of the responsibility for the defense of freedom.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator not aware that the United Nations is now acting pursuant to nothing more than unanimous consent?

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So that it would take only an objection from any Communist country to paralyze it completely.

Mr. DODD. If any effort is made to take any action, I am sure that is what will happen. So it is wholly unrealistic to say, "Get out of Vietnam and let the U.N. take over." The United Nations is in such a state of paralysis that it cannot take over anywhere. That is why I said—I believe before the distinguished majority whip entered the Chamber—that the statement of U Thant makes it preposterous to suggest that the problem be turned over to that organization.

The Secretary General has made clear what he would like to see done in Vietnam, and it is certainly not in the interest of a free world.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, one of my

colleagues has asked the question whether we can possibly find a solution to the Vietnamese problem which is satisfactory from our standpoint if it turns out that the Vietnamese people themselves want communism.

The mere posing of this question flies in the face of everything we know about communism. It makes as much sense to suggest that perhaps the people of Vietnam want communism as it does to suggest that the people of Vietnam, for some perverse reason, are enamored of earthquakes, or of leprosy, or of famine.

The record is clear that communism has never been accepted by any people anywhere, no matter how primitive they may be.

Even primitive people do not like to be pushed around and terrorized, and told what to do and what not to do. They loathe the compulsory indoctrination periods and the public brainwashing spectacles to which Asiatic communism in particular is addicted.

They do not like to see their religious beliefs ridiculed and defiled. They resent having the upbringing and guidance of their children taken out of their hands by an all-powerful Communist state.

Moreover, primitive peasants are passionately attached to the land that they till.

In every land where communism has taken over, thousands of peasants have died in resisting the confiscation of their lands and the collectivization of agriculture.

And even after they have been collectivized, their sullen resentment of the regime has expressed itself in the form of a subtle but effective sabotage of production which has converted even countries like Yugoslavia and Hungary, which formerly exported food surpluses, into food deficit areas.

The people of Vietnam have manifested their hatred for communism in a thousand different ways.

Certainly the 1 million refugees who fled from North Vietnam leaving behind them their homes and everything they possessed, have given proof of their hatred of communism.

Certainly, too, the 300,000 South Vietnamese who have fled from areas under Communist control have given similar proof.

Finally, millions of South Vietnamese have given eloquent testimony to their hatred of communism by the courage with which they have fought against it in the ranks of the Vietnamese armed forces or in their own village self-defense units.

If our information services were better organized, and if our press gave the same attention to our victories as they give to our defeats, the American people would have heard thousands of stories of inspiring heroism on the part of the Vietnamese people, fighting to protect themselves against the Communist terrorists.

At the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record a translation of an official Vietnamese telegram describing a recent battle fought by a Vietnamese militia unit against a Vietcong company.

I would like to pose a few basic questions to those of my colleagues who have urged that we turn the problem of Vietnam over to the United Nations despite the manifest inability of the U.N. to deal with a situation of this magnitude, or who continue to urge negotiations now when such negotiations would obviously culminate in nothing better than a diplomatic surrender.

If we abandon South Vietnam to communism, where do they propose to draw a new line against the advance of communism in the Western Pacific?

What nations do they believe should receive our assistance in defending themselves, and what nations do they believe we should not help to defend themselves.

If they propose falling back to a new defense line in southeast Asia or the Western Pacific, are they prepared to support a greater investment in aid and American manpower than we have now committed to the defense of Vietnam?

What concrete measures do they propose to prevent a massacre of anti-Communist elements in South Vietnam, on the genocidal scale that has characterized the establishment of Communist power, especially in the countries of Asia?

I believe that those who urge that we find ourselves an easy way out of our involvement in Vietnam have an obligation to weigh the consequences of withdrawal and to provide specific answers for the questions I have here posed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a translation of a recent telegram to Saigon dealing with a successful action against the Vietcong by local militia forces in Son My Village. I think this document is all the more significant because the unit involved on the Government side was made up for the most part of defectors from the Vietcong. The thousands of such actions that have been fought by village self-defense units and by units of the Vietnamese Army constitute the best answer to the suggestion that perhaps the Vietnamese people want communism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the communication of February 24 of Mr. Bushrod Howard, representative of the National Government of Yemen, to Secretary General U Thant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a tabulation of refugees from communism in Asia which appeared in a study of the Refugee Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee published only several weeks ago. According to this tabulation, there has been a flow of some 7,700,000 refugees from countries and areas under Communist domination. If we add to this tabulation 1 additional item—the 300,000 South Vietnamese who have fled

from areas under Vietcong control—the total number of Asian refugees from communism rises to approximately 8 million, which is the figure I gave in my speech of February 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[Unofficial translation]

OFFICIAL TELEGRAM

Originator: Administrative office, Quang Ngai.
Addressee: Special commissariat for Chieu Hoi, Saigon, text No. 313-CH/QNG.

Respectfully report to your commissariat: In the event of the operation to liberate the Son My village at Son Tinh district on February 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1965, the provincial Chieu Hoi armed propaganda platoon while on duty met with a VC company at My Khe hamlet, Son My village. The platoon has shown its drastic spirit of fighting in 3 hours and has wiped out the VC company. Specially Trinh-Song, the squad leader after carrying Le-Chuong a wounded comrade out of the battlefield, returned to command the fight until the end. He alone with a sub-machinegun has pushed back two assaults of the enemy, killed 15 of them and died after he had fired his last bullet. VC stabbed him all over his body with daggers. Soldier Dinh Tru (a mountaineer) a light machinegunner has protected his comrades and wiped out the enemy with 20 bodies left at the battlefield. Nurse Tran Thi Dao has courageously went out four times to the battlefield to take care of the wounded and died while performing her duty.

RESULTS

On the enemy's part: 35 VC bodies left behind and others being carried off.

On our part: Three died: Bui Minh, deputy platoon leader; Trinh Song, squad leader and translator; Thi Dao, nurse. Three missing: Phan Dung, squad leader, Le Tan May, and Nguyen Nuoi (all are soldiers).

At present, Son My village is completely liberated and construction works being implemented in the hamlets.

Our province remunerated each of these families 3,000 piasters and gave 10,000 piasters for funeral. We warmly complimented this platoon for its sublime fighting spirit and its righteous will of exterminating VC to give significant example to other units.

Respectfully yours,

QUANG NGAI.

FEBRUARY 12, 1965.

Forward to the province chief, deputy province chief for security.

Maj. LU BA KHIEU.

EXHIBIT 2

U THANT,
United Nations, New York:

Your intervention in American political affairs on Vietnam is in dramatic contrast to your silence to the Egyptians on their government's war on Yemen. You were responsible for a 14-month mission in Yemen under which Nasser promised you and the U.N. to withdraw from that country. For 14 months Nasser bombed and killed Yemenis before the eyes of your observers. Time and again he increased his army in Yemen and told the whole world that he would not cease his murder of the Yemeni people despite his pledge to you and to the U.N. You, Secretary General of the United Nations, were and are silent on Nasser in Yemen. We suggest you get Nasser out of Yemen and tell the great Egyptian people the true facts and background of the situation in Yemen. The Yemeni people still await you to speak in answer to the high motives you profess.

BUSHROD HOWARD, Jr.,

For the National Government of Yemen.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPT FROM THE INTRODUCTION TO "REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISM IN ASIA," A STUDY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, COMPILED BY ITS SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES

The toll in refugees of Communist aggrandizement in Asia is the subject of this report. The refugees include the following groups:

1. Approximately 5 million Koreans who fled from North to South Korea following the Soviet occupation of North Korea in 1945, and, subsequently, during the Korean war;
2. One million Chinese who fled into Hong Kong and Macao before the advancing tide of Communist military and political conquest, plus an additional 340,000 Chinese who escaped since 1950;
3. Nearly 40,000 Europeans from mainland China, 20,000 of whom were evacuated to the Philippines during 1948-51, the remainder having found their way into Hong Kong;
4. Some 960,000 Vietnamese who fled from North to South Vietnam, and adjacent areas, in 1954, plus additional thousands displaced by the current hostilities in South Vietnam;
5. Some 60,000 Tibetans who entered India and Nepal following the bloody suppression of the Tibetan revolt by Chinese Communist forces in 1959;
6. The many victims of the India-China border war in 1962; and
7. Approximately 240,000 inhabitants of Laos who, as a result of Communist activities, have been displaced from their homes in the countryside, and have fled to secure areas under the control of the Lao Government.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, some time ago the Senate considered Calendar No. 65, S. 21. I did not learn about it until a few days after the bill was passed. I wish to address myself to it.

Page D123 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 1965, shows under "Bill reported" the following:

Report was made as follows: S. 21, proposed Water Resources Planning Act, with amendments (S. Rept. 68), page 3392.

Turning to page 3392, there is a simple announcement of the submission of the report by Mr. ANDERSON.

The "Program for Thursday" as reported in the Daily Digest was as follows:

Senate met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 5:26 p.m. until noon Thursday, February 25, when it will continue its consideration of H.R. 45, to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act, pages 3451, 3454.

Referring to the body of the RECORD, there is no indication of anything else to be considered by the Senate on Thursday.

On Thursday, February 25, the majority leader moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 65, S. 21, and that it be made the pending business. The committee amendments were then printed in the RECORD, together with the bill as amended by the Senate committee. By unanimous consent, the committee amendments were agreed to and there was inserted in the RECORD an explanation of the bill. Then, except for a brief colloquy between Senator AIKEN and Senator ANDERSON with respect to the interpretation of the phrase, "The resolution of the States' rights issue in the field of water resource

"that somebody cares about them, is concerned about their future."

The director of the program is a 47-year-old educator, Thomas Flagg, who is assisted by a deputy and seven counselors. They roam from one city agency to another, wherever their young people are employed, inquiring as to their progress and with a willing ear for any problems, personal or otherwise.

"It seems to be working," the mayor said.

COUNTERING RIGHTWING TACTICS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate have become increasingly aware, over the past year, of the vicious nature and undemocratic methods of the extreme right. We have seen and heard of examples of the far right's infiltrating school boards, in attempts to distort—indeed, to destroy—the educational principles that have made this country great, and to implement, instead, their own authoritarian thoughts on education.

The activities of this lunatic fringe, however, do not stop with school boards. They have attacked our national leaders; they have viciously fought dedicated attempts to strengthen our efforts to deal with mental health; and they have hampered the attainment of civil rights for all our citizens. They have intimidated the volunteers of legitimate political candidates seeking election to positions at all level of government. Worst of all, the members of these groups have started rumors and have shouted lies about anything that differs with their perverse version of what is right, good, or healthy.

What truly saddens me is the fact that in the name of democracy, these often psychotic individuals have renounced the democratic methods. In the name of democracy, they have abandoned the principles that we live by, in favor of totalitarian terror and misrepresentation.

In view of these facts, Mr. President, it is heartening to read a pamphlet, recently published by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, that deals with directly meeting these threats to democracy.

I think this pamphlet is worthy of the consideration of the Members of the Senate, and I am sure that all Senators will find of interest the ideas stated in the leaflet. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this pamphlet, entitled "Extremist Groups: A Clear and Present Danger to Freedom and Democracy," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTREMIST GROUPS: A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER TO FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

Open membership: PTA memberships, now about 12 million, represent a fair cross section of America.

Membership is open to all who want to work for children and youth. There are no barriers of color, creed, occupation, or income.

The PTA is nonsectarian and nonpartisan. No one is asked what his religious and political beliefs and affiliations are.

The PTA is an educational organization dedicated to promoting the welfare of children through home, school, church, and

community. It welcomes all who want to learn more about children and act on their behalf.

Procedures: The PTA practices democracy. It welcomes dissent as well as assent. It does not impose conformity to any doctrine or dogma except democracy.

In the national organization, the State organization, and the local association, the rule is to abide by majority decisions and to respect the right of the minority to disagree and work for change.

Unity and diversity: What brings us together in the PTA—our common concern for children—is greater than anything that can divide us. Although there are bound to be differences of opinion where children and schools are concerned, PTA members are not youngsters who pick up their marbles and go home when they cannot have their way.

PTA members can tolerate diversity and act with unity and enthusiasm on majority decisions. This is the democratic way, the PTA way.

WAYS TO COMBAT UNDEMOCRATIC PRESSURES ON PTA'S, SCHOOLS, AND LIBRARIES

In the PTA: Appoint a committee to become informed on extremist groups, their "front organizations," and their tactics.

Devote a meeting to a factual report by the committee on extremist groups; their efforts to infiltrate PTA's and influence them to withdraw from the State and national organizations; and their undemocratic pressures on schools and libraries.

Establish the policy that resolutions and motions on controversial issues will not be voted on until the meeting following their introduction. This assures that the membership can be alerted and all views on an issue can be fairly represented and heard.

If someone comes up with a loaded, unanswerable question, ask him to rephrase it. Usually he can't, because it's a "canned" question.

Never mislay your sense of humor. A humorous remark has more than once pricked an inflated balloon.

Set a definite, reasonable time for adjournment. This assures that decisions will not be made by an extremist minority that outstays the moderate majority.

Look gift speakers in the mouth. Find out why they want to speak and whom they represent.

Keep the community and the press supplied with facts about PTA purposes and projects.

Schools: Urge school boards to do the following:

Have written statements of policy placing responsibility for curriculum decisions and selection of textbooks, films, pamphlets, and other teaching materials with teachers and educational administrative officials.

Have an information program to sustain community understanding of these policies.

Have clearly defined procedures for dealing with complaints on curriculum, books, and teachers. For example, require that charges and complaints be made in writing and signed by the complainant, referred to a special committee, and so on.

Libraries: Urge library boards also to have written policies on book selection; a public education program; and definite procedures for handling complaints.

Prepare in advance

Invite representatives from schools, churches, libraries, labor, industry, press, radio, and TV to a meeting to consider sound, democratic ways of dealing with extremist pressures.

Establish a joint committee for a continuing exchange of information and ideas.

Conduct a joint, vigorous education campaign to make the community aware of the importance of freedom of speech and freedom to read, to teach, and to learn.

If an attack comes

Bring it out in the open.

Insist that charges and complaints be specific, written, documented, and signed.

Ask the school board or library board to hold public hearings.

Get full press, radio, and TV coverage.

Seek advice and help from the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, your State congress, and from such groups as the State education association, the National Education Association, the American Library Association, the National Council for Civic Responsibility, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies, and local and State colleges and universities.

EXTREMIST GROUPS: BOTH OF THE RIGHT AND OF THE LEFT

Most of us believe in the right of others to hold and to express views, even extreme ones, that differ from our own. (Extremist groups try to stifle free expression of views opposed to their own.)

Most of us believe that free access to information and a diversity of opinions are essential in a democracy. (Extremist groups try to purge school and public libraries of publications that are objectionable to them.)

Most of us believe the public schools should not indoctrinate students in the political, economic, religious, or social views of any group. (Extremist groups put pressures on schools to adopt courses and textbooks that reflect their views.)

Most of us believe that criticism of public institutions and officials is healthy, but that criticism should be informed, constructive, and based on facts. (Extremist groups make irresponsible, venomous, and near-libelous attacks on individuals, institutions, and organizations that disagree with them.)

Most of us believe that political, social, and economic change should be brought about by legal, democratic procedures. (Extremist groups use coercion, intimidation, and even violence to prevent or force change.)

Most of us believe that patience, good will, and intelligent, cooperative effort are needed to deal with complicated issues and problems. (Extremist groups are likely to believe there are easy, simple, fast solutions to complex problems and to advocate oversimplified, very often dangerous, measures.)

Most of us believe in rule by the majority, subject to criticism by a "loyal opposition." (Extremist groups believe in rule by their own minority and label any opposition as "disloyal.")

Tactics of extremist groups

Front groups: Extremist groups set up front organizations with high-sounding, patriotic names to promote their views.

Free speakers: They offer to provide free speakers in order to spread their propaganda.

Infiltration: They infiltrate democratic organizations like the PTA and try to capture key positions like the program chairmanship.

They send representatives to meetings with prepared, loaded, unanswerable questions to harass speakers whose views differ from theirs.

They prolong meetings so they can make minority decisions after the worn-out majority has gone home.

"Divide and conquer": They try to discredit State and national organizations and create distrust of their leadership in order to isolate local associations and capture control of them.

They encourage irrelevant programs and debates over organizational details to disrupt the work of an organization and divert it from its own productive activities.

Blacklisting and labeling: They probe into the personal history and political affiliations of educators, clergymen, and authors and

label as "subversive," "un-American," "radical" those whose beliefs and affiliations differ from theirs.

Hysteria and fear: They create fear and insecurity by highly emotional, inflammatory charges of subversive influences in schools, government, and community organizations.

Coercion and intimidation: They threaten investigations of school administrators, teachers, librarians, and members of school and library boards who resist pressures for conformity to their views.

Some groups use social ostracism, economic pressures, and even violence to silence disagreement and impose their views on a community.

Misrepresentation: They make false charges and use quotations taken out of context. They distribute smear literature and poison-pen pamphlets, usually imported from outside the community.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE CITIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we have declared war on poverty, and we want better and more livable and attractive communities. An important contribution toward the attainment of this goal is public housing. Its extension and strengthening, called for by President Johnson, are basic to solving our problem of urban poverty. In fact, people in the public housing field have been concerned with poverty for over 26 years, since practically everyone served by the public-housing programs is in the lowest income group.

A statistical cross section of the tenant population of low-rent housing projects shows that: 52 percent are non-white; 47 percent are receiving assistance or benefits; 24 percent are elderly; 36 percent of the families with children are one-parent families; and 82 percent of the elderly and 25 percent of the non-elderly have no gainfully employed worker in the family.

The median total annual income for elderly individuals in public housing is \$1,100, for elderly families \$1,900, and for nonelderly families \$2,800.

These are disadvantaged families subject to all the stresses imposed by poverty, ignorance, squalor, ill health, and the lack of skill required to participate effectively in the urban labor market.

Not only does public housing help solve the problem of providing adequate shelter for these people, including those displaced by renewal, but it also provides social services and incentives to help them become better citizens.

Poor families in public housing share with poor families everywhere the ugly byproducts of poverty, which include problems of motivation, health, education, employment, and social adjustment. The Public Housing Administration, in close cooperation with other government and welfare agencies, and national service organizations, has been attacking these problems through demonstration services task forces and community services programs. Wholesome environments are created and maintained to develop facilities, programs, and services for these low-income families that will help them help themselves.

In the new war on poverty, the Economic Opportunity Act provides nu-

merous poverty-eliminating programs which are directly relevant to local housing authority participation.

Title I of the act provides three separate programs for youth—a Job Corps, work-training programs, and work-study programs. Who is in a better position to identify potential candidates for these programs, call the programs to the attention of these youngsters, and motivate them to participate, than the project management staff of the local housing authorities?

Also, title II of the economic opportunity legislation is intended to stimulate and provide incentives for communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs. Such programs would provide services and other activities to develop employment opportunities, improve human performance, motivation, and productivity, and to better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work. All local housing authorities have already been involved in such action programs, and they will work in close cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity in accelerating these community efforts.

Public housing is a cornerstone in the national public welfare program. Its basic philosophy is that the end result must be better living for its tenants and their neighbors, better neighborhoods and community growth, better housing and better living. It all adds up to a better city.

U.S. CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in a recent article, Joseph Young, of the Washington Evening Star, paid tribute to the Government's civilian employees who are on the frontlines in battle-torn Vietnam.

These courageous and dedicated public servants deserve our most humble thanks. They symbolize the willingness of our civil servants in this country and around the world to do their job, and do it well.

They live and work under extremely hazardous conditions, and without military escorts.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Young's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 16, 1965]
U.S. CIVILIAN WORKERS PRAISED FOR THEIR
COURAGE IN VIETNAM
(By Joseph Young)

A firsthand report on how Government civilian employees are ably and courageously performing their duties in battle torn Vietnam has been made by the Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance in the State Department.

Howard E. Haugerud had high praise for employees of the Agency for International Development and those in the Foreign Service, after returning from a month's inspection trip there.

Haugerud reports:

"Many of these men whom I visited are living under extremely hazardous conditions and are constantly subject to injury, kidnap-

ing, or death at the hands of the Vietcong infiltrators, snipers, terrorists, and regular military units.

"They must work with and be respected by the district chiefs, village and hamlet leaders, and often remain in the hamlets overnight in the homes of these leaders who are generally 'marked men' by the Vietcong. In order to carry out their missions, they must work in areas infested with or threatened by the Vietcong. They must do so without military escort and generally unarmed because of the allegedly more severe penalties inflicted by the Vietcong in the event of capture while carrying weapons.

"My purpose in writing is to call attention to these Americans, many of whom are young and junior in grade. Because their activities are conducted mainly with the Vietnamese people and because they are away from the large population centers engaging in vital but nonspectacular work, I do not believe they are receiving the public credit that is due them."

This reporter is happy to pay credit to these courageous and dedicated public servants, and by doing so stress that Government civilian employees throughout our history—in war, peace, and emergency—have always served their country faithfully and well.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] losing his rights to the floor, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by furnishing economic assistance to friendly countries and areas, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1367) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill which I introduce is in partial implementation of the President's foreign aid message of January 14, 1965, recommending authorization for military and economic programs aggregating \$3.38 billion of appropriation requests.

This bill is concerned solely with the President's request for authorization for appropriation of \$846 million for economic aid. This authorization for eco-

RESOLUTION 27—APPRECIATION: ASSISTANT SECRETARY KENNETH HOLUM, ADMINISTRATOR NORMAN CLAPP

Be it resolved, That Mid-West Electric Consumers Association express its sincere appreciation for the outstanding services rendered by Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, and Norman Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, in promoting the interests of the electric consumers of this Nation, and particularly the consumers of the Missouri Basin; be it further

Resolved, That Mid-West commend Mr. Holum and Mr. Clapp for their efficient administration of their respective agencies.

RESOLUTION 28—COOPERATION WITH OTHERS

Be it resolved, That Mid-West Electric Consumers Association express its appreciation for the support of the following organizations: Organized labor, general farm organizations, American Public Power Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Electric Consumers Information Committee, statewide municipal and rural electric organizations, Federal agencies, Missouri Basin systems group; be it further

Resolved, That Mid-West direct its staff to continue working with these organizations in achieving its program of resource development.

RESOLUTION 29—COMMENDATION

Whereas Thomas G. Bonar assisted in the founding of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association and has served as a member of its board of directors since that founding; and

Whereas the vision, faith, and leadership of Tom Bonar and the Union Rural Electric Association have brought the preference customers of the Platte River Basin to realize that cooperation with other preference customers in the Missouri River Basin is the only way in which the resources of the entire Missouri Basin can be brought to full development; and

Whereas Tom Bonar served as president of Mid-West from 1961 through 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Mid-West Electric Consumers Association commend Thomas G. Bonar for his vision and faith in Mid-West and the opportunities for such an organization to lead the way in the full development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources; be it further

Resolved, That the members of Mid-West express their appreciation to Tom Bonar for his leadership, devotion, and hard work as a founder-director of Mid-West and for faithfully carrying out the duties of the office of president.

RESOLUTION 30—COMMENDATION

Whereas Harold R. Lee served faithfully and effectively as Executive Secretary of Mid-West Electric Consumers Association for 3 years; and

Whereas Mr. Lee gave of his time, effort, and ability in furthering the cause and fulfilling the purposes of Mid-West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of Mid-West Electric Consumers Association extend its sincere appreciation and wholehearted thanks to Harold Lee for a job well done.

RESOLUTION 31—CONDOLENCE

Be it resolved, That the members of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association express their sorrow at the untimely death of its president, Henry T. Swenson, and extend to his family their heartfelt sympathy and gratitude for his untiring effort over the years in behalf of Mid-West and the consumers of the Missouri Basin, and for his

outstanding contributions to the success of Mid-West both as a director and as its president.

RESOLUTION 32—CONDOLENCE

Whereas we have learned with sorrow of the death Sara Radin, the beloved wife of Alex Radin, who has contributed so greatly to the success of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association in his capacity as general manager of the American Public Power Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Mid-West Electric Consumers Association extend its sincerest sympathy to Mr. Radin and his family in their bereavement.

RESOLUTION 33—CONDOLENCE

Be it resolved, That the members of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association express their sorrow at the death of Henry Hope, and extend to his family their heartfelt sympathy.

RESOLUTION 34—APPRECIATION

Be it resolved, That the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association express its appreciation to the city and county of Denver, the Denver Convention and Visitors Bureau, and to all others who have had a part in the planning and preparations for this 1964 annual meeting.

GOP MAGNIFICENT IN VIET CRISIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as again the United States is being challenged on a distant battlefield by a totalitarian enemy, the Republican leadership of the Senate and the House has asserted its support of President Johnson in the critical situation in Vietnam. As it has in the past, the Republican Party is today placing the national interest above all other considerations.

The significance of this endorsement was analyzed recently by the nationally syndicated columnist, William S. White. Mr. White wrote:

Magnificent is the word for the Republican Party and its congressional leaders in the crisis of national purpose and national will and national honor that is rising in southeast Asia.

Rarely in history has a minority party given such wide and generous support to an administration of the opposite party as is now being granted to President Johnson in his efforts to help halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam and thus to blunt the most recent grave challenge of international communism to peace and world order.

Mr. White went on to commend the minority leaders in each body, Senator DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD R. FORD:

In their actions the phrase "responsible opposition" is taking on the dignity of fact; it is a reality, not merely an expression of what is desirable. If the President is able to bring this Nation through the trials of Vietnam without the strain of appeasement, on the one hand, or the horror of major war in Asia, on the other, these men will have played a memorably significant part.

Mr. White ended his analysis by particularly praising Senator DIRKSEN, stating:

For the last 4 years, at minimum, no public man alive has more faithfully, more courageously, more wryly, and more responsibly served the higher purposes of this

country. There ought to be a kind of medal for unassuming—and absolutely irreplaceable—service of this kind.

Mr. President, these are words of high praise, indeed; but they have been earned by the leadership displayed under the most difficult of circumstances by Senator DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD R. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "GOP Magnificent in Viet Crisis," by William S. White, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1965]

LOYAL OPPOSITION: GOP MAGNIFICENT IN VIET CRISIS

(By William S. White)

Magnificent is the word for the Republican Party and its congressional leaders in the crisis of national purpose and national will and national honor that is rising in southeast Asia.

Rarely in history has a minority party given such wide and generous support to an administration of the opposite party as is now being granted to President Johnson in his efforts to help halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam and thus to blunt the most recent grave challenge of international communism to peace and world order.

The assistance being extended by the outs to the President, Mr. Johnson, is if anything, even greater than that extended to a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, by Mr. Johnson and his senior Democratic colleagues when the Republicans held the White House and the Democrats held Congress.

Whatever else may or may not be done in this Congress by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois, the Senate Republican leader, and Representative GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, the House Republican leader, it will be dwarfed by the historic contribution they are making to keep this country strong and united in the face of foreign war.

Indeed, watching them at work one can almost believe that as a nation we may have actually reached here, for a time anyhow, that heretofore impossible and unattainable ideal—a politics, as to foreign affairs, of a maturity to match the complexity and gravity of these affairs in this decade. No doubt politics-as-usual will shortly descend over the scene; even so DIRKSEN, FORD and Co. are entitled to the most earnest of salutes for what thus far they have done and tried to do.

In their actions the phrase "responsible opposition" is taking on the dignity of fact; it is a reality and not merely an expression of what is desirable. If the President is able to bring this Nation through the trials of Vietnam without the stain of appeasement on the one hand or the horror of major war in Asia on the other these men will have played a memorably significant part.

It is a curious thing to see how, when the heat is really intense and the way ahead is hard and hazardous, some high political reputations begin to look just a bit dubious and some hitherto more or less routine and pedestrian reputations begin to develop a strength, a vitality and an intellectual candor that had been, by most people, wholly unexpected.

So it is now. Some so-called foreign policy experts on the Democratic side in Congress speak for a new and cleverly worded form of isolationism. Because things are admittedly sticky in Vietnam, because the non-Communist regime we assist is admittedly weak and scarcely "democratic" as we understand the word, these people have only

March 4

a policy for surrender wrapped up in talk about the righteousness of "negotiation."

But negotiations are not possible with marauders until first they have been forced to cease their killing and looting and until first they have given some evidence that the end of any new "negotiation" will not be the same as the end of all other "negotiations" going back to 1954—that is, uninterrupted Communist aggression.

So Dirksen, Ford and Co. see the reality for what it is, describe it for what it is, and rejecting short-term partisan gain at the expense of the administration, stand with the President and the Democratic majority—and, in this case, with the vital interests also of the United States of America.

Now, Ford is a young man and no doubt has much of life and hope ahead of him. But Dirksen is an elderly man, by definition a man nearing the end of the long trail, and a far from hale and well man, too, if it comes to that. He has taken many a lump in his time, and a good many of them, in my opinion, he had coming to him. For he was not always the Dirksen of today; not any part of the Dirksen of today.

But for the last 4 years, at minimum, no public man alive has more faithfully, more courageously, more wryly and more responsibly served the higher purposes of this country. There ought to be a kind of medal for unassuming—and absolutely irreplaceable—service of this kind.

NEWARK JOB CORPS A SUCCESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is indeed heartening to learn of the notable success of the job corps in Newark, N.J. As a pilot project, the Newark Job Corps has removed all doubts about the worth of the program.

The young men and women in the corps have been in a training program sponsored by the city of Newark. Under the leadership of its very able Mayor Hugh E. Addonizio, the city has taught these young people the skills necessary for useful employment. The girls have learned to be nurses aides, librarians, and the like; the boys have been working in maintenance, communication, and so forth, with the city's various departments.

The success of the Corpsmen in learning new skills has passed all expectations. These youngsters, all of whom are high-school dropouts, have proved themselves so capable in their new tasks that the city is considering keeping many as full-time employees.

But an even truer indication of the success of the program is the fact that nearly 50 percent of the members of the Corps have resumed their education. It is heartening to know that the Job Corps has met the challenge of persuading these youngsters of their error in letting their education drop, and has induced them to begin again, where they left off.

I commend Mayor Addonizio and Mr. Thomas E. Flagg, director of the program, for their outstanding efforts to help in making this pilot project the success it is.

I am pleased to bring this program to the attention of the Senate, for I think my fellow Senators will enjoy knowing that the efforts and deliberations of Congress are paying off in rich dividends for less fortunate members of our society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles concerning the Job Corps in Newark, from the New York Times of February 15, be printed in the RECORD. I hope all Senators will derive the same feeling of satisfaction that I felt upon reading the articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST YOUTH CORPS IN NEWARK HAILED (By Charles Mohr)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz reported to President Johnson today that the Nation's first Neighborhood Youth Corps in Newark had dispelled the idea that the Corps was a make-work concept.

In a statement of reply, Mr. Johnson said the Newark experiment "has encouraged and heartened all those associated with it" and added that Mr. Wirtz' report was "an early indication that we can succeed in this best of all efforts."

The Neighborhood Youth Corps program is a major part of Mr. Johnson's antipoverty program. Full-time and summer programs are planned to give useful employment and training to school dropouts. The first Neighborhood Corps project in the Nation has been in operation in Newark since January 4.

Mr. Wirtz said today in a memorandum to the President that "its success has been so heartening and meaningful that it warrants a special report to you."

A THIRD CHANCE

Mr. Wirtz said that the Youth Corps enrollees were doing "jobs that would not ordinarily be done" and that "these are jobs that ought to be done in the public interest."

But he put even higher emphasis on a statement that "the single most important result of the program thus far is in the proof it has provided that young persons disheartened by failure at school and discouraged by failure in the labor force do respond with hope, confidence, and effort when given that important third chance."

Mr. Wirtz said that there were now 346 boys and girls at work in Youth Corps programs in Newark's schools, hospitals, library, museum, planning board, and other public agencies.

The total will eventually rise to 700. The youths work 30 hours a week. All of them were dropouts from school and were unemployed before volunteering for the program.

He said the total cost of the program was \$520,000 of which the Federal Government had contributed \$465,000.

THE 180 RETURN TO SCHOOL

Secretary Wirtz said that the brief experience at Newark had led to several conclusions that already seemed warranted.

One was that work with the Youth Corps "does stimulate a desire to return to school" and that already 180 of the Newark enrollees had registered at night.

He said the desire to resume an abandoned education was prompted by "the awareness that education is all important in landing a job" and by the "growing feeling of confidence, fostered by their performance at work, that they can succeed."

Mr. Wirtz said it also appeared that the counselors supervising the program had been able, through personal attention and genuine interest, to inspire the youths. He quoted one counselor as saying of the youths:

"Some of them seemingly feel that they are not important to anybody, that nobody does care about them. Well, we care."

Mr. Wirtz' brief report relied heavily on quotations from interviews with young persons enrolled in the program. He quoted one young man who said he dropped out of

school because his cousin had told him it was the way to "see the world."

The young man was quoted as saying, "I dropped out and I saw it—the unemployment line."

He was asked, "Have you taken this up with your cousin?"

"Did I," said the boy. "He's got two black eyes to say that I ain't going to drop out of school no more."

A girl was quoted as saying that she now wants to return to school. She said: "A high school diploma is more important now—and a college diploma is more important than a high school diploma. You can't hardly get a job without a diploma."

Mr. Wirtz wrote to Mr. Johnson, "This birth of second-generation hope is a reward without price."

The Wirtz report said that 112 youths were working in the Newark city hospital and at the Ivy Haven Home for the Aged. Most girls are working as nurses' aides, but eight enrollees are working in the pathology department and five in the dietary department.

Twenty-seven are working in the library, museum or in other offices of Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio. Some youths are working in city offices such as city planning, finance, personnel, and treasury. Thirty boys work in the city motor department learning vehicle repair and 13 boys work as linesmen's helpers for the police and fire department communication lines.

A SECOND CHANCE FOR 348 NEWARK DROPOUTS

NEWARK, February 14.—Hundreds of young men and women, many of whom never worked a day in their lives, have recently become very useful to the city of Newark—and to themselves.

Until this year, they were merely part of a grim statistic, part of a young population that had quit school and, without skills or ambition, faced the future with little hope.

Since January 4, however, when the Neighborhood Youth Corps began its pilot project in Newark, hundreds of these young men and women have had a second chance.

WORK AND SCHOOL

They were taught how to work; they were encouraged to go back to school. Today, of the 348 16- to 21-year-olds enrolled in the program, 180 are attending evening school, if not full-time day school, and all are employed. Their jobs pay \$1.25 an hour for a 30-hour week.

All work for the city of Newark. The work depends on their aptitudes. Some of the young men are tree trimmers with the Newark Park Department, or sign painters with the Newark Traffic Department, or mechanics' assistants in the city garages.

Some have learned to use jackhammers and work on city road projects, and some of the girls have been trained as typists, nurses' assistants, file clerks, library workers.

During the 6 weeks, somewhat less than 20 youths quit the project—a small percentage for a program involving dropouts.

The great majority of youths are learning quickly and proving to city employers the value of the program. For example, the director of the Newark Police Department, Dominick Spina, who has employed 25 young women, said:

"Their work has been so good that I am recommending several to be hired permanently by the city."

A high percentage of the 348 boys and girls in the program are, according to Mayor Hugh E. Addonizio, Negroes from homes of extreme poverty. Many quit school, he said, to help earn money for their families, realizing too late that they were unqualified to work, or had never learned how to work.

Now, in addition to work habits, they are learning something else, the mayor said:

out that early fears the legislation would produce restrictive shipping legislation in other countries had no foundation; it countered the argument that cargo preference was undesirable as an indirect subsidy on the grounds that it was, quite plainly, a direct subsidy; and finally, the report speculated that the permanence of the Public Law 664 legislation would provide an incentive for the construction of a modern and efficient dry bulk fleet.

Unfortunately, our experience since that report has not borne out the predictions of its authors. Since 1956, 15 countries have adopted restrictive shipping legislation, and most of the maritime world points to U.S. practice as the cause. Whatever may be said regarding the futility of such laws for the countries in question, and their impact on American trade, it seems clear they are not in the best interests of American shipping. As a subsidy, direct or indirect, cargo preference has been a miserable failure: Not a single new tramp ship has been built since 1956, and the cost of keeping the old ones in existence climbs higher and higher. A converted 10,000-deadweight-ton Liberty employed in the grain trade costs the taxpayers about \$700,000 in freight-rate differential payments annually. By contrast, our most modern liner ships, with 40 percent more carrying capacity and twice the speed require an average of only \$500,000 per year; this means an equivalent shipping capability at 25 percent of the subsidy cost.

Here, too, the American people are faced with a number of alternatives.

1. Present programs could be continued—at least so long as there is an agricultural surplus disposal program. The result would be a steady rise in subsidy cost as these vessels become increasingly inefficient, followed by a rapid decrease in the cost as the subsidy disappears with the ships.

2. The tramp fleet could be eliminated more quickly by simply eliminating the cargo preference program.

3. Cargo preference could be continued, but supplemented with construction subsidy for replacement ships. Because the present production of 100 tramp ships easily could be matched with only 22 modern dry bulkers, however, any meaningful dry cargo fleet cannot be hitched alone to the cargo preference grain trade. The future of the dry bulk fleet, like the rest of our merchant marine, necessarily depends upon the capacity to compete for commercial cargoes. Moreover, adding construction subsidy on to the existing cargo preference system would provide subsidy without any provision for mandatory ship replacement, for reserve funds, for recapture, or for any of the other safeguards of the public interest built into the 1939 act.

4. Cargo preference could be eliminated gradually, no faster than some form of direct operating subsidy is substituted for it, making it possible for these ships to compete for commercial cargoes at world rates. Dry bulkers are more simple ships than liners, and proposals have been made to construct, for example, a 30,000-ton ship for as little as \$9 million, and operate it with a small crew and only \$300,000 to \$400,000 in annual operating subsidy. In order to give you some idea of what these figures mean, if the present \$80 million per year spent on cargo preference freight rate differentials were all paid in operating subsidy to such new ships, we could maintain about 200 modern dry bulk carriers, with a total capacity about 8 times our present dry bulk fleet. Even with reduced crews on highly mechanized ships it is obvious where the greatest long-term job opportunity is to be found.

Necessarily, in making these choices the number of competing interests is too great to satisfy everyone completely. In discussing

various new ideas with members of the industry, I sometimes feel like the fellow whose wife bought him two ties for Christmas, one red and one green. He expressed delight with both, and when she appeared skeptical about the genuineness of his feelings, he put on the red one to prove it. "What's the matter," she said, "don't you like the green one?"

This kind of a reaction is especially common in discussions about our passenger ships.

American operators have 13 remaining passenger ships, staffed with crews ranging from 260 to 1,000. In 1965 these ships will absorb almost one-quarter of the total money available for operating subsidy—about \$46 million. And if they are expensive to run, they are even more expensive to build. The Government's share of replacing the SS *United States* today, for example could run to about \$100 million. Like any other major investment the benefits derived from these ships—to the industry and to the Government—deserve the closest examination. The arithmetic is striking.

In 1962 the then 15 passenger ships produced a loss, before subsidy, of about \$44 million. The subsidy amounted to \$48.7 million, or more than 10 times the after-subsidy profits for the 15 ships. In 1963, financial results were little better. The subsidy bill was nine times the companies' profits after subsidy. Eight of the fifteen ships lost money even after subsidy, and two others did little better than break even.

By contrast, comparable figures for general cargo ships show a subsidy bill only two or three times profits after subsidy. For the companies operating both passenger and general cargo ships, the gross revenue from cargo operations was three times that for passenger operations, and profits after subsidy were more than seven times as high.

It is not surprising that shipowners have shown little inclination to replace their passenger ships.

Nor do the passenger ship operators have much hope for improved profits. The productivity of cargo ships has increased in recent years. But 73 percent of the crew on a passenger ship are stewards—cooks and waiters—and mechanization can do little to increase their productivity. Indeed, it is this personal service which tends to attract those relatively few people who travel by ship rather than air.

Even if passenger ships are not a profitable business for the owners or the Government it is often argued that they are of great benefit to us as a nation. If so, they are surely worth the investment. But what are these alleged benefits?

How about their balance-of-payments contribution? In 1963, the net balance-of-payments contribution of U.S.-flag passenger ships was about \$47 million. Since we spent about \$46.3 million in subsidy to secure that saving, you can see that it was bought rather dearly. By contrast, in 1962, the international commercial airline industry contributed \$128 million to our balance of payments from passenger fares alone—and without the necessity of any contribution from the taxpayers. Or compare the like figures for general cargo ships. In 1963 the net balance-of-payments impact of the 285 subsidized cargo ships was about \$204 million—at a subsidy cost of approximately \$135 million. Thus, even by standards of return on shipping subsidy, the balance-of-payments impact of \$1 of subsidy spent on a cargo liner is almost double the impact of a dollar spent on a passenger ship.

Prestige is also said to be a benefit of passenger ships. Of course, prestige is an elusive thing. Our present operating subsidy expenditures for passenger ships would support close to 100 modern liner ships, which might well do more for our prestige around the world than a few passenger ships known to be highly unprofitable.

Moreover, two important reasons for having a merchant marine—trading leverage and stability of freight rates—are virtually unaffected by passenger ships.

Finally, there is national defense. Historically, passenger ships have played a major role in our defense efforts. During World War II, for example, most of our troops were transported in ships which once sailed as commercial vessels. By the time of the Korean hostilities, however, the situation had changed and only one passenger ship was removed from commercial service for troop carrying to the war zone. Three small passenger ships under construction were transferred to MSTs but were fitted primarily as passenger ships for military dependents. All other troops were carried by MSTs troop carriers or by air.

Our defense needs today still call for a passenger ship capability. But the development of new aircraft, like the C-141 and the recently announced 600-passenger plane, is eroding the justification for heavy Government investment in constructing and maintaining commercial passenger ships.

To some extent modern cargo liners could be converted to effective troopships if necessary. Even commercial passenger ships must be converted to troop-carrying conditions—increasing their troop-lift capacity sevenfold. But this takes time, and insofar as we still need conventional passenger ships it might better safeguard our national security if the conversion were done in advance, and the ships preserved in the reserve fleet in a high degree of readiness—at about one-tenth the present actual cost.

But all of this analysis really adds little to the stark economic reality that American businessmen have little desire to build and operate passenger ships at a loss. Unless some presently unforeseeable change comes about, some 5,500 jobs will disappear from these ships over the next 10 years irrespective of how the Government feels about the wisdom of this \$50 million subsidy account.

The question before us is not whether the 5,500 jobs will be affected, but whether any ships and jobs will be substituted in their place.

Of the 5,500 men on passenger ships about 4,000, or 73 percent, are stewards who can find ready transferability of their skills in the hotel and restaurant trades. But what of the 1,500 deck and engine men? Their jobs are not as easily transferable. If the \$42 million passenger ship subsidy were used for cargo liners—even the most highly mechanized now imaginable—we would need about 3,000 men to operate them. The road to true job opportunity seems clear.

Finally, I want to say a few words about two aspects of our present system of paying operating subsidy.

First, the trade route idea.

At the present time the Maritime Administration has designated 30 trade routes and 3 services as essential to the foreign trade of the United States. A subsidized shipping company wishing to move from one trade route to another is required by law to undergo a long and arduous public hearing, effectively eliminating its ability to respond rapidly to competitive pressures. In addition, an operator's activities on any particular trade route—the frequency of sailing and the ports at which his ships call—are all subject to the approval of the Maritime Administration.

Many questions are called to mind. Is it not strange to have this high degree of protectionism for American operators against only a small part of their competition? For U.S. trade route restrictions obviously do not affect the foreign companies carrying about 70 percent of our liner cargo. What is the impact of these restrictions on the behavior of American shipping companies? What are

March 4

the supposed benefits of the system, and how real are they?

It is usually urged that the trade routes underlie the "service" concept of the 1936 act, and that they serve to prevent cutthroat competition. Each of these assertions requires close examination.

As for the first, to my knowledge there is not a single American operator serving a trade route because he was ordered to do so by the Maritime Administration. In each case the operator requested permission to serve that route because there was cargo to be carried. Look, for example, at the number of foreign companies, which may come and go much as they please, serving small ports on regular schedules because the existence of cargo makes it profitable for them to do so. Look at the American companies providing regular service to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico for the same reason. There is no reason to expect that American companies in foreign trade would act very differently even if not bound by the strictures of the trade route concept.

And if there is not sufficient cargo to justify shipping services at all, I doubt very much whether the framers of the 1936 act intended that American companies be compelled to service ports at a loss to themselves as well as the taxpayers. For example, if it is cheaper to ship cargo by barge from a smaller to a larger port and then out by ship, that is probably the way the cargo ought to move. That is the basic principle underlying the new Lykes sea barge clipper concept.

I doubt, therefore, if a relaxation of the present rigorous trade route requirements would undermine adequate service for American shippers—quite the contrary.

Many shipowners have told me that the tortuous procedures necessary to gain permission to operate on a different trade route, even for a short time, have forced them to forgo many attractive commercial opportunities—to the benefit of the merchant fleets of other nations. This reminds me of the story about the Cape Cod garbage collector, whose weekly charge was 25 cents. One newcomer, seeking to do a little better, asked for his monthly rate. "\$1.50," was the reply. When the newcomer inquired why the monthly rate should be so much higher than four times the weekly rate, the old man replied, "The entry is for beln' tied down." I rather suspect that we may be paying "entry" for tying down our shipowners, too.

We turn, then, to the question of cutthroat competition. Whenever I hear that term, I am reminded of a story an old Texan used to tell about the general store in the small town where he grew up. The store had a monopoly for many years, but as the town grew it began to attract new business, and in due course a competitor opened his doors across the street from the general store. The old proprietor began to bemoan his fate to the town at large, and one young man, recently back from a freshman economics course at the local college said, "But sir, isn't that just competition?" "Oh no," he replied, "it's worse than competition." Some shipowners have expressed similar sentiments to me, explaining that they have competition now, and that relaxing trade route restrictions would be worse.

Since trade route restrictions have no impact on the activities of foreign shipping companies, the danger arising from a relaxation of the trade routes must be seen to come from the competition of other American shipping companies. Some shipowners feel that a new American company will come on the route and take one-half of the "American" cargo, putting them both out of business.

But, by and large, an established steamship company will tend to stay on its old routes, since it is costly and time consuming to develop new trade relations. Moreover, such a

company will consider carefully whether it can make a sufficient dent in the foreign market on a new trade route. With such high capital costs, few shipping companies would be foolhardy enough to enter a wholly new competitive environment solely with the idea of taking away from a preexisting American company most of its established business.

Moreover, shipping conferences will tend to act as a moderating force. For example, foreign-flag companies would seem to be in much the same position vis-a-vis each other as would American companies in the event of a relaxation of trade route restrictions. Yet there have not been a series of protracted rate wars.

There is, of course, a perfectly legitimate basis for fearing the activities of an irresponsible "raider," an operator with no interest in establishing any sort of trade relations, whose sole aim is to skim off the cream of the trade at the peak of the season with exceptionally low rates. But this problem can be solved without abandoning the whole idea of trade route flexibility. There would seem to be no reason why a procedure could not be designed to sift the serious competitor from the fly-by-night.

The present rigid system prevents companies from taking advantage of fluctuations in world trade. And to the extent that it is an effective shield against competition, it tends to insulate the companies on the trade route from the salutary effects of competition. Finally, the present system puts into the hands of the Government too much of the question whether a shipowner will change trade routes.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about what has come to be called an incentive operating subsidy. I have spoken about this issue at length in the past, and there is no reason to belabor it here. But there is one common misconception which I would like to clear up.

A number of people have told me of their impression that the incentive subsidy is an economy measure—that we will somehow end up with a lower subsidy bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. An incentive subsidy may result in increased productivity, higher profits and wages, and relatively less need for subsidy. But whatever the needs for subsidy may be they must be met if the industry is to continue. No one argues with that basic truth.

I think that \$380 million is a substantial sum and, as Maritime Administrator, I feel an obligation to insure that it is spent in the most productive way possible. If it is being spent under a system which could be improved, then that standard has not been met. If it is producing one less ship than it could, and I remain silent, I am not doing my job.

In the shipping business, like most others, profits may be increased by cutting costs or increasing revenues. But operators have little incentive to reduce subsidizable costs under the present system, for the Government will simply pay them less in subsidy. This puts a responsibility on the Government alone to maximize the public's return from its subsidy bill. Often Government is forced to take positions which segments of labor and management find objectionable. But under the present system it is inevitable.

On the other side of the profit picture, one of the chief means for most businesses to increase the utilization of their capacity is by reducing rates.

The conference system, however, precludes this. It would seem obvious then that the system could be substantially improved, especially by providing some meaningful incentive to management and labor to cut costs—removing the Government from the process.

As I see it, and as I hope you do, as well, there are many alternatives open to the American merchant marine. Each of our

problems has at least one solution. Some require the expenditure of much larger sums of money; others seem to spell the continued decline of the fleet. Still others seem to promise more shipping capability at a relatively lower cost—even though perhaps pointing the way to larger total expenditures.

The American merchant marine is at the crossroads. Basic decisions must be made. They must be made by you, and every American concerned about our trade and economic growth. We cannot hope to make every decision exactly right, but when the alternatives are clear before the people their record is pretty good.

The problem is worthy of our effort.

A SPECULATION ON VIETNAM—ARTICLE BY DR. HARROP A. FREEMAN, CORNELL LAW SCHOOL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record an article by Dr. Harrop A. Freeman, professor of law, Cornell Law School, Ithaca, N.Y., entitled, "A Speculation on Vietnam." I hope some of the aids at the White House will read it and at least give the President a review of the article, because it expresses the point of view that the President ought to be following, instead of the warmaking policy he is following in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A SPECULATION ON VIETNAM

(By Dr. Harrop A. Freeman, professor of law, Cornell Law School, Ithaca, N.Y.)

The current temper of most liberals and peace-minded persons in the United States seems compounded of shock and terror, as the U.N. General Assembly virtually dissolves and the United States steps up the war in Vietnam with no apparent readiness to negotiate. For myself, I prefer that the core of decision as to Vietnam be based on what the Vietnamese (north and south, Government and rebels) desire, and on the Vietnamese as people. (I shall later make some suggestions as to how to bring this into the political picture). The fact still remains that Vietnam has become a political problem not left to the Vietnamese and if there is to be any solution we must so deal with the problem.

Without myself championing or advocating that view, it may just be that politics see and are working out a solution either by design or accident, more immediate than we generally concede. I propose to examine some of the relevant factors.

It is generally agreed that the United States throughout the past century has been able to operate the Pacific Ocean as an American lake and has sought, but never really had, a foothold on mainland Asia (the Dulles family has been central to this movement). The Defense Department found the network of British-French-Dutch possessions in Asia of utmost importance in World War II against Japan, and cannot tolerate the thought that they should not be available in another Asian war (e.g., against China). The entry of Hawaii into the Union, the independence of the Philippines, and the present stance of Japan have been used as further justification for this policy. France held the line in Indochina for 10 years till 1954. We tried to persuade them and/or England to continue. After the Geneva accord moved France out and created Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam we took over military aid in 1955 to a South Vietnamese Government we installed. By 1955 the

International Control Commission (Poland, India, and Canada) found both North Vietnam and South Vietnam with the aid of the United States to be violating articles 16-18 of the accord. It is not important to set the stage for our discussion, to trace the denial of elections, the changes of government, the degree to which we were responsible therefor, or the step-up of American military participation (from a few thousand military advisers to the present 30,000 combat troops and jet air bombers).

The first point I am making is that U.S. policy will not surrender a land base in South Asia. Not having signed the 1954 Geneva accord the United States could have no recognized or legal base there. More recently it has been deprived of any legal base in Laos (1962 accord) or Cambodia (neutralist position); other Western footholds in Malaysia-Indonesia and Burma are disappearing; even Thailand (which has always picked the winner) is less certain. This fixes American policy to show a resolve to hold some foothold, even if illegal, in South Vietnam at all cost, and to refuse any negotiation which would remove us from Vietnam.

The second point flows from this. In order to give some semblance of a right to remain in Vietnam the United States must insist, and attempt to prove that the war is like Korea. That is, that the South Vietnamese are directed and supplied by North Vietnam, that North Vietnam is actually waging war (that this is not a civil war) and violating the Geneva accord, that the United States is now there on behalf of the U.N. and world community to prevent and punish North Vietnamese violations. We have therefore seen all of these developments recently: (a) revelation of 80 tons of North Vietnamese arms shipments sunk off South Vietnam, and a new "white paper," February 27, 1965, supposed to conclusively show North Vietnam arming of the Vietcong; (b) proof of 19,000 and estimates of 15,000 infiltrations in 1964 from the north, and the assertion that half came in 1964; (c) opinions that all the original South Vietnamese had already been exhausted by 1963 and that these new recruits were North Vietnamese volunteers; (d) the story of the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos justifying our bombing portions of Laos contrary to the 1962 agreement signed; (e) provocations in the Tonkin Gulf, at Pleiku and other sneak attacks directed by the Hanoi regime; (f) to which we could and did retaliate only against troop staging areas in North Vietnam; (g) the coming of South Korean troops to aid in South Vietnam to give some semblance of international cooperative action.

The third factor to be considered in assessing present prospects is that we were in fact losing the South Vietnamese war with our own weapons, on at least five fronts. (1) The Blue Book of the State Department (1961), Secretary Rusk's Economic Club speech (1963), and Secretary McNamara's National Security Association talk (1964) pictured South Vietnam as an economic miracle like West Germany but the new Senate Foreign Relations Committee's "Background Information" volume deletes all this—because in fact with all our aid the country is an economic shambles. (2) We can't even stage successful coups in South Vietnam or Laos—we failed in three in the last 3 months, and there have been 8 political upheavals in 14 months. Even with \$1.5-2 million per day we can't bolster up and keep operating a government in Saigon. (3) With all the talk of infiltration and foreign arms, it is still officially documented that over 80 percent of the Vietcong arms are captured American weapons and no North Vietnamese troops are being captured—Pleiku was shelled by 100 Vietcong located 1,000 yards from the American airstrip, using American mortars. (4) A force of 500,000 government troops and 25,000 Americans

have been gradually pushed back by 25,000 regulars and 50,000 to 75,000 irregulars. (5) The Saigon government does not now control more than one-fourth of the people and one-fifth of the territory.

The fourth aspect helpful in policy assessment is the known divergence of views between Johnson-McNamara on the one hand and the Joint Chiefs of Staff (joined by the "warhawks" of Congress) on the other. The President's position has been in the past clearly a wait and see, stay in but don't escalate position and such war method was McNamara's war. But, apparently in getting the reduction in military budget he wanted and in the difficult local situation in South Vietnam a compromise has been made with the warhawks for limited or safe escalation (I suspect in return for agreement to negotiate out the problem under appropriate circumstances—see below).

A fifth current factor was Kosygin's visit to North Vietnam. It was known in advance, and was soon confirmed, that he was going to advocate negotiation but also furnish Ho Chi Minh with antiaircraft guns and missiles. President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and Secretary McNamara have long stated the theory of negotiation: "No negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible as long as the Communist hope to achieve victory by force * * *. Once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible." (Johnson, Apr. 21, 1964); "Our task in Vietnam is clearly to make aggression seem hopeless. Out of that new realization can come new grounds for a negotiated settlement * * *. Premature negotiations can do little more than ratify the present achievements of the aggressors and this we will not do" (HUMPHREY, Aug. 17, 1964). If America intended to make the war seem hopeless to the North Vietnamese and Vietcong (who were gradually winning) it needed to make new powerful sorties, and if possible it needed to picture these as defensive or retaliatory. Further, if these were to be successful and at little cost (in loss of lives and equipment) they had to be prosecuted before modern weaponry was furnished to the north. Therefore the retaliation strikes from the Gulf of Tonkin the end of last year and those after Pleiku this month. One or two planes were lost instead of perhaps 20 to 25 if they had faced land-to-air missiles later. Now we seem to have settled back into the "oil spot" theory or Hop Tuck plan stepped up by the Americans doing the flying and bombing, to extend the Saigon control into the provinces around Saigon and thus mark a turn in the loss pattern. The air strikes against North Vietnam have occurred; right or wrong they are a fact. If they are to be used as positions of strength, then negotiation must follow almost immediately. Otherwise the war will settle down into another stalemate and perhaps another loss pattern, from which we cannot continue to rescue ourselves by cries of attack and retaliation. In fact, the present strikes seem to make no sense except as prelude to prompt negotiation.

A sixth element entering into present evaluation is the increased interest of other countries in South Asia, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out. In the 1950's the French got out of Indochina, the British refused Dulles' request to help take over, they were getting out of Malaya and Burma, the Russians and European states generally were losing interest in Laos and the whole area. America essentially decided to go it alone. Now Indonesia's U.N. withdrawal, Malaysian independence, the ideological conflict of Russia and China, the Gaullist independent line, the Cambodian neutralism, and many other factors have caused Britain, Russia, France, China, and the U.N. countries generally to take a new interest in South Asian affairs. This may mean an opportunity for the United States to accept a France-Rus-

sian negotiation bid or a larger role for the U.N., and at the same time save face.

Now, it seems to me that the recess of the U.N. General Assembly over the payment of assessments issue fits into this picture as a seventh feature. Since America is aware of the shaky legality of its position in South Vietnam, if it feels it has a dirty job to do before negotiations can take place, then the wise thing to do is to close down the world's debating forum wherein we might be called to account. The United States had the cards to either force the payment issue or to seem to be conciliatory and put the issue over. It apparently elected to play them for suspension of the Assembly—a decision which makes most sense to me when related to the Vietnam crisis.

An eighth event that surely plays its part in a variety of ways is the Chinese A-bomb. That explosion notified all south Asian countries that China intends to become the great Asian power. It tended to bring to the fore the few American policymakers who would like an excuse to bomb the Chinese atomic production facilities as a means of delaying Chinese power. It seems to have persuaded Russia to reenter the south Asian scene. It apparently has brought out from North and South Vietnam a desire to negotiate the South Vietnamese war and obtain a neutralist zone which can become consolidated before China's influences can predominate. It increasingly demonstrates the necessity for some way of bringing mainland China into the world government community.

The growing American debate on Vietnam may be viewed as a ninth relevant fact; perhaps it may even be that the President's capitulation to some escalation was to strengthen his side of the argument, for the strongest voices for negotiation and withdrawal came from the President's own liberal Democrats, and he had to recruit the Dirksens to stem the tide (Newsweek, Mar. 1, 1965). It is not merely Senators MORSE and GAUVENING who are involved. Added are CHURCH, McGOVERN, CLARK, COOPER, and others, and even men like RUSSELL, GORE, FULBRIGHT, and MANSFIELD. In January the Associated Press survey of 80 Senators showed 3 favoring getting out of Vietnam at once, 10 desiring immediate negotiation, and 31 favoring negotiation as soon as the military situation improved: only 7 advocated bombing North Vietnam or America using combat troops. Sources near the President—Joseph Alsop and Joseph Kraft—at the end of January were indicating a rejection of the domino theory, a recognition of the necessity for negotiation, a feeling that the new coups might be setting the stage, and they also evidenced opposition to this development. The debate has continued strong now for nearly a month in Government, in academic circles, in the press.

The final factor to be considered is the increasing evidence that North Vietnam and both native sides in South Vietnam desire to negotiate an end to the war, and that insofar as bases of negotiation have been stated they involve continuance of two Vietnams, independence, neutralization, nonalignment with China, and peaceful interrelations, a position which should be acceptable to the United States.

We cannot examine all the evidence, and we do not have all the evidence on this important point. We do know: (a) that U Thant reports North Vietnam's present willingness and readiness to negotiate on such basis (February 27, 1965), (b) that the South Vietnamese Buddhists have at all times favored such negotiation, (c) that the new power structure there (Ky, Vien, Thi) may embody this position, (d) that all the French news reports coming out of South Vietnam indicate that the National Liberation Front favors a neutral belt including South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, (e) that ever since 1963 European diplomatic and intelligence

March 4

4050

sources have stated that North Vietnam would be willing to accept a united or separated Vietnam guaranteed neutral and without interference from Peiping, Moscow, or Washington (New York Times, Nov. 7, 1963), (f) Dr. Bernard Fall, after interviews with Ho Chi Minh and his foreign secretary, found the same attitude in 1962 (Fall, "The Two Vietnams," 199), (g) that this was still stated to be the North Vietnamese position by British Member of Parliament William Wasby as late as February 1, 1965, after his talks, (h) and that Walter Lippmann has consistently throughout 1964 seen such negotiations as feasible and with North Vietnam occupying an essentially Titoist position (e.g., May 28, 1964).

A REASONED NEGOTIATION

What may all this add up to? Could it be something like this:

1. There never has been a time when military victory in Vietnam was possible. Even if military victory were possible, it could not achieve the political settlements required. The military presence has only rendered more difficult the civil conflict and prevented the independence, economic development and community necessary. There is only one ultimate possible course—to take the problem to the conference table.

2. But, there is no point to reconvening the Geneva Conference or trying to reinstate the 1954 Geneva accord. The proposal to so do automatically gets the U.S. reply that until China and North Vietnam fulfill the agreements no purpose will be served by such conference. The 1954 conference represented the then interest in southeast Asia and those interests are not now the same; to reinstate that arrangement would merely underline the illegality of the U.S. position in Vietnam, the fact that the United States did not sign and is not a supervisor of that arrangement; many of the then provisions (e.g., for 1956 elections) are now applicable; Vietnam now requires treatment as part of the new picture of the whole Indochina peninsula.

3. The principles of the Geneva accords (1954, 1962), however, are still sound and likely to form the basis of agreement. That is: A cease-fire; independent free nations (which may later unify if they desire); neutralist in foreign policy (perhaps extended to mean an actual neutralized area); with all foreign military personnel, arms, and bases barred; free trade and mutual support between North and South Vietnam; with these conditions guaranteed by the family of nations, and particularly the most concerned nations.

4. If the United States wants a foothold in Asia, it is better that it be given a legal one as one of the guarantors of the settlement, to be checked by the others responsible and answerable to the U.N. and world community, rather than as a unilateral supporter of a favorite. Those in the United States who urge U.S. withdrawal from its present Vietnam action should not fall backward into the pit of isolationism.

5. The negotiations should be primarily between Saigon and the National Liberation Front, with North Vietnam, the United States, and China in the background and joined in guaranty of the final agreement by the U.N. and/or Russia, France, Great Britain, and the major Asian countries. This would avoid a direct U.S. confrontation with China; it would retain the facesaving fiction that this war was not of our making; and it allows for solutions (of a type I am sure will be required) acceptable to the Vietnamese, but which we have said we cannot accept. It would also be a most effective push toward a stable, broadly representative and civilian government for South Vietnam.

6. If the agreement could then be made a U.N. document and U.N. supervision be assured, some semblance of accepting the U.S. 1955-65 activity as in place of the U.N. could be maintained, and U.N. interest in

south Asia (to which the U.N. has paid little attention) might be assured.

7. A Vietnam settlement just might be a very important step in the larger picture of world peace. Two of the hardest problems relate to mainland China: (a) How can the rest of the world, and particularly the United States, deal with her, and (b), how can China's and Russia's relationship to each other be kept in a form least harmful or most helpful to the rest of the world? There are those who would never allow China to enter the U.N. and fear any negotiation with her as breaking this isolation. There are those who welcome ideological or political conflict between Moscow and Peiping as Communist weakness. I submit that bringing China into negotiations as to Laos and Vietnam is precisely the method for including her in the world community and encouraging her to keep the peace, without yet facing her admission to the U.N. I also submit that everyone knows that when the chips are down the Communist countries will stand together, and the real question is whether in an entente the ideological position will be moved toward that of Russia (more favorable to the United States) or toward China (less favorable), and that negotiations on Vietnam at the behest of Russia and France would certainly move toward the Russian position.

8. Finally, it would seem that a negotiated settlement now could shift the whole emphasis to a massive economic rehabilitation program, a great TVA for the whole Mekong Delta. I need not review how far such plans and actual operations have gone, even during the war, with the cooperation of both sides, and of the Commission report thereon, or the great increase in U.S. nonmilitary aid. Such a program would keep the interested countries committed to the area—but in a nonmilitary pattern; it would put attention back on people, the local people; it might be a demonstration of how development for emergent countries could really occur.

All this suggests the possibility that far from being a moment of despair, the present juncture of affairs may hold the key to effective negotiation, avoiding the long 5- to 20-year stalemate in southeast Asia which so many observers were predicting. Mankind must so hope.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Statesman on the same problem, which also expresses the point of view the Senator from Oregon has expressed so many times—that we ought to be proceeding with honorable negotiations instead of making war in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman, Feb. 9, 1965]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The war escalator in Vietnam is working. Under the name of retaliation U.S. Navy planes pounded North Vietnam installations Sunday. This was to avenge the Saturday attack of the Vietcong on a U.S. base in which eight Americans were killed and 108 wounded. In addition, American planes or helicopters were destroyed. Promptly President Johnson ordered the air strike. It was followed on Monday by a strike by the Vietnamese Air Force with an escort of U.S. fighter planes. And on Monday President Johnson warned the Communist nations not to miscalculate American strength or American will.

The response from Moscow and Peiping

was denunciatory and threatening, but strictly verbal. Both Red centers put themselves on record, but neither made an overt move by way of re-retaliation. It is obvious though that these border raids may be built up into full scale warfare.

This news from Vietnam is very depressing. The ostensible purpose—to defend freedom—is badly blurred by the indifference of the South Vietnamese to self-defense and the antagonism of some to the presence of Americans. We are thus caught in a two-front war—with the Vietcong, aided by their Red allies, and with the hostile South Vietnamese.

As far as the raid on the American base is concerned, the success of the Vietcong is humiliating. There had been a previous sneak attack that proved costly. Why was not there proper security around this camp? In the former raid we blamed the Vietnamese forces for failure to observe the raiders. Once stung, we should have put on adequate patrols of our own. Clearly an inquiry should be initiated, if it has not been already.

This U.S. Navy plane strike was not made against the Vietcong who had staged their own attack, but against a staging area in North Vietnam. The idea was to hit back at North Vietnam as the supply source for the Vietcong. If we pursue that line we may need to drop bombs on supply lines from Red China.

Leaving aside the question as to whether we should stay in Vietnam or pull out, we may explore this question: whether these hit-run raids will be effective. In other words, can we interdict the contribution of men and supplies from North Vietnam by air strikes? It is doubtful. World War II showed that even saturation bombing was only partially successful. It will be harder to paralyze North Vietnamese supply depots and routes because guerrilla warfare doesn't rely on mountains of supplies and mass armies.

It may also be doubted that the punishment will induce Ho Chi Minh to abandon support for the Vietcong. It may have the opposite effect—instill the Vietnamese to more active support of the Vietcong and hostility to the American "imperialists."

One wonders if the President's order wasn't issued in part to kill off the rumor of a "deal" for the settlement in southeast Asia. The coincidence of the visits of McGeorge Bundy to Saigon and Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union to Hanoi started tongues wagging that they were trying to set up some kind of deal. The Sunday air strike surely flattened that talk. Each interchange of bombs reduces the chance for peace by negotiation and increases the chance of graduation into big scale fighting.

All the Sunday air strike does is to show that we have power in the area which we can and will use, under certain provocation. It adds nothing to delineation of our long-range policy, and leaves us apparently running on a treadmill, getting nowhere, hoping that our wind and strength will hold out long enough to bring victory over the Vietcong.

This is a chapter in American history which evokes little pride and arouses fear of deeper involvement.

"FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ONE KIND OF WAR WE CAN'T FIGHT"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an article by C. L. Sulzberger, from the New York Times of March 3, 1965, entitled "Foreign Affairs: One Kind of War We Can't Fight," in which he shares the view that we are in Vietnam as a result of what has been labeled "McNamara's War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1965]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ONE KIND OF WAR WE CAN'T FIGHT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—Some wars become associated with the names of individuals, and thus we have the Napoleonic Wars, the Black Hawk War and the War of Jenkins' Ear. There have been those who have sought to label the Vietnamese campaign "McNamara's War," after the U.S. Secretary of Defense and, politics aside, this is not wholly unjust.

MC NAMARA'S INFLUENCE

For Secretary McNamara has clearly had more influence in our evolving Vietnam policy than his senior colleague, Secretary Rusk. McNamara has been a familiar Saigon visitor; his former military right hand, General Taylor, is now Ambassador there; and U.S. Indochina strategy is more heavily marked by the Pentagon than by the State Department.

American defense plans during the past decade have carefully and expensively prepared to fight the only kind of war we are least likely to face. And we have not in any major sense prepared to fight the kind of war both Russia and China surely intend to press.

When post-Stalinist Moscow endorsed peaceful coexistence it always reserved one vital area. It openly promised to support, wherever possible, what it calls "wars of liberation." Khrushchev tried to play a trick on us in Cuba, but he had to back down because he was patently not engaged in a liberation war—only in directly threatening our vital interests. Our strategy was prepared for such a showdown.

However, when the Communists stick to their own rules they have a demonstrated advantage. The modern elaboration of guerrilla techniques called "revolutionary warfare" by the Communists does not depend on heavy weapons or atomic arsenals. It depends upon simultaneous organization of partisan units and civilian administrators who seek to rot a selected country from within like fungus inside an apparently healthy tree.

For years we refused to face the fact that, equipped as we were for holocaust, we had neither the trained manpower nor the political apparatus to fight revolutionary warfare. To some degree, under both President Kennedy and the brilliant McNamara, this was rectified—but only in part. Even today, when we have growing special service counter-guerrilla units, some with kindergarten training in revolutionary warfare, we are abysmally behind.

It is expensive and ineffectual to blow up jungle acreage or fill it with paratroopers in search of vanishing guerrillas. And we have nothing capable of offsetting what revolutionary warfare calls "parallel hierarchies" (known in Vietnam as Dich-Van)—the secret political apparatus that undermines morale and softens up the population.

SHIFTING STRATEGY

U.S. strategy tends to shift according to availability of weapons systems. It has moved from "massive retaliation" to "flexible response" and from land bases to sea-borne armadas. But, while we are engaged in blueprinting superplanes and super-rockets, we risk losing the world to guerrillas.

Vietnam is "McNamara's War" because, in fighting it, we have overstressed the military and ignored the political aspect. We have, furthermore, been preoccupied with selling an American way of life and political philosophy unsuited to the people we would help.

FACING THE THREAT

The heart of the crisis is not truly in Vietnam. The quintessential problem is how to defeat revolutionary warfare. Elsewhere in Asia and Africa we will continue to face the threat of this technique no matter what happens to the Vietnamese. That is incapable.

Not merely the aggressive Chinese but the relatively less aggressive Russians are committed to sponsor "wars of liberation." Despite this glaring truth, both in weapons and in training we are basically prepared alone for the war our adversaries don't intend to start.

VIET CHESSBOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Viet Chessboard," from the San Francisco Examiner of February 26, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIET CHESSBOARD

Both the military and diplomatic aspects of the fighting in Vietnam are stepping up.

For the first time, American jet bombers manned by American crews have been in operation against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam (as distinct from strikes against North Vietnam).

Diplomacy is engaged on a wide front in exploring chances for negotiating a settlement. The activity includes the Paris-Moscow dialog, the quiet soundings of Prime Minister Wilson's government, and those of U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Of all this subsurface seething, Mr. Thant's efforts (what has come to the surface, that is), seemed to be based on realism. He is not advocating, he emphasizes, immediate withdrawal of American forces. He recognizes that "some sort of stability" must come first.

That is precisely why the Johnson administration has refused to commit itself to negotiations now. There can be no worthwhile negotiations until there is stability. There can be no stability until the Communist guerrilla aggressions cease.

ARTICLE ENTITLED "PRESIDENT CAUTIONS CRITICS OF VIET POLICY NOT TO FOMENT WAR"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record an article with the headline "President Cautions Critics of Viet Policy Not To Foment War." Here is one voice that will not be silenced by any propaganda coming out of the White House. It is not the critics of the President who are fomenting war; it is the policies of the President of the United States that are fomenting war in Vietnam. The American people ought to let him know that they do not want additional American soldiers to die and they want that war to stop.

The words of the President are the words of a frightened man, one who recognizes that his brinkmanship could easily take the country into a war the American people will not long support.

I can understand that the President is anxious that his Asian adventure not be discussed or analyzed by any but its architects and executors. But silence, and total endorsement without under-

standing, are not the way a free people conduct their international affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1965]

PRESIDENT CAUTIONS CRITICS OF VIET POLICY NOT TO FOMENT WAR—JOHNSON REPORTED IRKED BY COMMENTS WITHIN OWN PARTY

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Johnson took note of the continuing debate on Vietnam policy yesterday with a warning that misunderstandings about America's true intentions could lead to war.

With congressional critics apparently in mind, the President said that some of his predecessors have experienced more trouble from domestic than from foreign critics.

The President spoke at a White House ceremony honoring winners of the Science Talent Search as new debate on Vietnam broke out on Capitol Hill.

LIKE HITS "SECOND-GUESSING"

In Palm Desert, Calif., former President Eisenhower indirectly endorsed the President's position.

After a meeting with new Republican National Chairman Ray C. Bliss, the former President said that "if we fail to recognize the responsibility of the President we will divide the country."

General Eisenhower said that if he differed materially with the President he would communicate directly with him. He said that he and Bliss were not going to try to "second-guess" the President.

Mr. Johnson has been unusually annoyed, it has been said, by Democratic Senators who have assailed America's position in southeast Asia.

"PEACE IS FIRST PURSUIT"

The President told the high school science winners that he hoped they would never experience war. He said he prayed every day that "we won't have to call" on America's young people to fight again. "But rather than yield our liberty we will," he declared.

While "peace is our first pursuit," he emphasized, "we must defend freedom not only against enemies without but against enemies within."

"Some of the great Presidents who have lived in this house have found that misunderstanding in this country and problems that arose in this country, and leadership in this country, caused them really more troubles than leadership in the world," the President said.

"That was true of Woodrow Wilson, that was true of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that was true of Harry S. Truman."

It was even true of President Eisenhower, Mr. Johnson added, "although I did all I could to minimize any of the great differences." Mr. Johnson was Senate Democratic leader during General Eisenhower's two terms.

The President said he had "not the slightest doubt" that some wars have been brought about because of lack of understanding "among our own people, and the fact that we conveyed the impressions to others which they accepted and acted upon which were not really representative of the views of our country."

While Mr. Johnson was speaking, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, told the Senate that the President was "trying to keep the lid on a dangerous volcano in southeast Asia."

MANSFIELD praised the administration's "white paper" on Vietnam and denied charges that the administration has no policy in Vietnam.

But Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, a persistent critic of administration

4052

policy, said that the white paper could "best be described as a Swiss cheese" because it is so full of holes.

The United States sent thousands of men into South Vietnam, MORSE said, and "now we get excited because North Vietnam went in. Why shouldn't they?"

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who has often differed with Mr. Johnson on other matters, said the President's policies offer "the best chance for us to achieve an enduring peace in this complex situation."

Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada, commended PROXMIER for his speech, and told the Senate:

"This is no time for negotiation. . . . Even the discussion would lead our allies to believe we are abandoning them."

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, likewise strongly backed the President. He praised him for his "candid" briefing to Senators and said that Mr. Johnson "made it perfectly clear we intend to stay in Vietnam until our responsibilities have been achieved."

"To negotiate from weakness," SCOTT went on, "would be to transfer the war to Thailand. If Thailand goes, Burma goes, and India would be under the gun. The question is where do you stop running. We would cease to be a Pacific power, forced back on Guam and the Hawaiian Islands."

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, a frequent critic of U.S. policy, said that the white paper added "no new facts to the already muddy water" in Vietnam.

"We have been aiding South Vietnam on a scale far surpassing the aid given by North Vietnam," GRUENING said.

Wyoming's Republican Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON said the United States had the "strength and power" to conclude Vietnam war and should do so.

And in the House, Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, said that he expected the administration to seek some sort of negotiated settlement to get out of the "impossible situation" in Vietnam.

"There is, in my mind, little doubt that the conflict in Vietnam will end in the not-too-distant future in some sort of compromised settlement that cannot help but lead to an eventual Communist takeover," LAIRD said.

In New York, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon repeated his proposal for naval and air strikes against military targets in North Vietnam.

"The white paper contains 'clear and conclusive' evidence that the United States is helping South Vietnam defend itself against aggression from North Vietnam," Nixon said.

ARTICLE ENTITLED "HARMONY PREVAILS BETWEEN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the February 1956 issue of the publication, *Washington World*, contained an article entitled "Harmony Prevails Between Business and Government."

Because this article points up the confidence that business, together with other segments of our American scene, have in the Johnson administration, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARMONY PREVAILS BETWEEN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

The eyes of the Nation remain on Washington as U.S. businessmen continue to exhibit an attitude of fingers-crossed optimism toward the Johnson administration.

Although the President's blueprint for universal prosperity has not yet been reduced to specifics and revealed to a hopeful business community, the influx of industry representatives into the Greater District of Columbia area is accelerating already.

The climate of mutual confidence that now prevails in current Government-business relationships—the best in decades—has created greater-than-ever focus on Washington, whose residents confidently anticipate that the city is approaching a new height of political-economic influence.

As if Washington were determined to set the pace for economic expansion in the Nation, new programs are unveiled almost daily to beautify, renew, build, and rebuild, portending an expanding role for the city in the Great Society of the immediate future.

Besides massive public and private construction of office space in recent years, a sizable portion of the aggregate spending has been disbursed by people investing in the hospitality services which cater to conventions and casual visitors alike.

Lyndon B. Johnson adopted the Great Society as his slogan soon after he became President. His hopes and dreams were outlined in generalities in last month's inaugural speech and in his state of the Union address. The annual budget message contained some details on implementation of the program, and there will be other special messages to Congress which hopefully will elaborate still more.

The principal objection so far raised to the Great Society is that it tries to provide—or at least to promise—something for everybody. That objection, of course, embodies the very reason it has received such widespread public approval.

The aim of greater prosperity at all levels of American life naturally would be of vast benefit to American business—for business serves and sells to all levels of citizens. Thus far the President has done nothing to indicate that he will pursue his grandiose goals by impinging upon the domain of private enterprise to a sufficient degree to arouse protests.

The existing rapprochement, and the roseate foretokens of continued cordial relations, on the public-private front enhance the importance of Washington, the seat of the Federal Government, in the councils of business and industrial leaders in New York, Detroit, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other financial centers.

Businessmen are watchfully waiting to see how the administration will face up to the inescapable responsibilities that accompany its elevated stature as the free world's most important economic power. They await proof of a determination to achieve a sound, strong domestic economy with stable prices and an adequate growth rate without additional crippling controls upon businesses or individuals.

If these accomplishments are forthcoming, the White House is certain to retain prompt, easy access to the inventiveness and pragmatic experience of many men whose genius has taken them to the helm of giant corporations.

Nation's Business, published monthly by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, chose "Business and Government" for its January cover story. Corporate leaders spoke frankly on their interpretations of the proper roles of Government in the Nation's economy. The article concluded with this statement by Henry Ford II:

"When Government economic policies are wisely chosen and wisely and efficiently applied, when they work with rather than against market forces, when they are directed at the causes rather than the symptoms of economic problems, when they give due weight to unintended results as well as the direct goals of any given measure, when they expand rather than contract the opportunities of free men—when such conditions

are met, then we can be sure our Government is assuming its proper economic role."

The cooperation and advice that the business sector seems willing to contribute are desperately desired and actively sought by President Johnson. In turn, corporate executives are manifesting greater confidence because they are convinced the President realizes he needs a lasting partnership of business and industry with the Federal Establishment.

Because industry and Government equally appreciate the present mutually advantageous rapport, businessmen are expected to travel to Washington in increasing numbers during the next few years, both as individual visitors and to attend meetings and conventions of their trade associations and other professional groups, insuring even greater development of the city.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

DEATH OF DR. HERBERT CARLYLE LIBBY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in the passing of Dr. Herbert Carlyle Libby, of Waterville, Maine, and Pemaquid, Maine, the State of Maine has lost one of its most illustrious sons. He was an outstanding scholar and statesman and a leader of magnificent proportions. The world in which we live was a better place because of him.

He was one of the early political liberals in Maine although in his later years he grew more conservative. He was the wise counselor and friend of innumerable Maine citizens and he molded many of the young students he taught into future leaders.

He was one of my very best friends for without him I would not now be in the U.S. Senate. In fact, he was the manager of my very first campaign back in 1940 when I first ran for the House of Representatives. To him I owed so very much.

In his passing, I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Libby and the family. I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial of the March 1, 1965, issue of the *Waterville, Maine, Sentinel* be placed in the RECORD at this point as it so capably evaluates Dr. Libby.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel*, Mar. 1, 1965]

HIS INFLUENCE SURVIVES HIM

Colby College recently established a Herbert Carlyle Libby Prize in Public Address. It will go to the best speaker in the college and is a fitting memorial to the vigorous man for whom it is named.

Dr. Libby, who died Saturday, had as one of his many duties while on the college staff the instruction of public speaking and throughout his life he was an active participant in public affairs.